BELIEFS AND PRACTICE

Compiled by:
Muhammad Shafi
(May Allaah forgive him)
Rabi uth Thani 1373, January 1954

Translation edited by
A.H.Elias (Mufti)
20th Zill Qadah -1432
18th October -2011

Contents Page

ٱ ٻ ٻ

الحمد لله وکفی وسلام علی عبادہ الذین اصطفی خصوصا علی سیدنا محمد المصطفی ومن یهتدیه اهتدی

Just as every class of society knows the words Imaan, Islaam and Kufr such that the illiterate of the deviated groups also know it, similarly, it is just as difficult to provide a comprehensive, all-encompassing definition for them. This is not specific to Imaan and Kufr, but regarding general words the meaning of which a child too does not have any doubt or misgiving. For example, hat, shirt, trouser, shoes, house, table, chair, jug, glass etc. However, if there is a question regarding a comprehensive all-encompassing meaning of these words, then the greatest of masters will be confused. Even after giving a definition after thinking and pondering, there will be danger that probably some individual has been left out of the understanding or something that is not part of the purport will fall into the definition.

The scholars of before, the Mufassireen, the Muhadditheen, juro-consultants and Mutakallimeen have provided complete definitions for Imaan and Islaam then they have defined Kufr and have discussed at length its types and have written separate booklets on it. In these times, the treasure house of Islaamic knowledge, the chain of scholars, the teacher of teachers, my master and teacher Hadhrat 'Allamah Maulana Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmiri (RA) - former head teacher at Dar ul Ulum Deoband wrote a complete and detailed book on this subject titled 'Ikfaar ul Mulhideen'. The cause for

writing the book was that a special type of Kufr called Zandaqah or Ilhaad and is the hypocritical Kufr of this time – in order to differentiate it from Islaam and Imaan – and in order to differentiate between Zindeeq and Muslim has always been a ruling that required thought. Based on the general ignorance of the knowledge of Qur'aan and Hadith in this time, it has become even more difficult since seeing that the Mulhideen and Zanaadaqah are propagating the worst Kufr in the guise of Islaam, they have become part of the Muslim society and are biting the Muslims in the guise of a friend while they are foes. Many pious hearted Muslims have also fallen into the trap such that whoever says that he is a Muslim he should be understood to be a Muslim even though he has some other type of beliefs and does other types of actions. In today's time it is called intelligent politics. However, the necessary result of this is that Islaam does not refer to any reality or belief or viewpoint but it is some word that has no meaning. Whoever wants to, he can have any type of belief, he can stay firm on his thoughts and actions and be a Muslim. Islaam cannot enforce any ruling on him.

The amount of destructive consequences for Islaam and Muslims of such a Fitnah needs no explanation. Therefore, it has become an important need of the time to clearly explain this type of Kufr that is in the clothing of Islaam and that has come into vogue with the practise of Islaam.

In this matter, two things are such that leave alone the masses, even the people of knowledge can fall into confusion regarding it.

a. Generally the juro-consultants and scholars have clearly mentioned that whoever has some belief of Kufr but he does not state so clearly, but he holds that

view with some interpretation, he will not be called a Kaafir. It is also quite apparent that whoever together with claiming Islaam also chooses some Kufr belief or view, then he definitely will use the barrier of some interpretation and choose it. The result will be that it will not be permissible to call anyone who claims Islaam to be a Kaafir whereas the clear texts of the Qur'aan and Hadith contradict this. Therefore it was necessary that the unanimous principle of the juro-consultants and the Mutakallimeen is clarified, the statement that says that if someone has a Kufr belief together with interpretation, then it does not cause Kufr.

b. This ruling is proven from a clear authentic Hadith and it is accepted amongst the scholars and juro-consultants that anyone of the Qiblah cannot be called a Kaafir. The result of this is that apparently the one who claims to be a Muslim and makes the Ka'bah his Qiblah, then no matter how incorrect beliefs he has regarding Allaah and His Rasul (SAW), and he mocks them, he cannot be called a Kaafir.

Both of these doubts are based on knowledge and research. Therefore, it became more necessary to clarify the reality. That is why Hadhrat Ustaadh Hadhrat Shah Saheb (RA) lifted his pen and wrote on this subject. He wrote a unique book, such a book the like of it in terms of comprehensiveness was not written before it.

However, firstly, this book is in Arabic. Secondly, Hadhrat Shah Saheb (RA) is such a high ranking scholar that in order to grasp what he says one needs to be a great scholar one's self. The

consequence was that the masses were deprived of taking benefit from it already and the daily retrogression in ability (Isti'daad) also deprived most of the people of knowledge. The moment the book was published, many people requested that the subject matter of it be written in an easy way and clear Urdu. Many people brought this to my attention as well and I felt this need from before already.

However, destiny had it that this work be delayed until today. Now that the Fitnah of Qaadiyaanism has taken a new grip in Pakistan and the hunters who mix and confuse Kufr and Islaam have brought a new trap into the arena.[1] Therefore, this matter once again became a matter of debate for the Muslims of Pakistan. At this time, the need was greatly felt and taking the name of Allaah, the pages before you were begun.

In this work, all the subject matter, discussions and research of our honourable teacher has been taken but the sequence and explanation is all of this lowly one's (the author). Our honourable teacher hinted towards a special Fitnah and his answers were towards specific objections. Therefore, the detailed research of Islaam and Imaan or Kufr and its types were not in the book. This lowly one has added and without making the beliefs and thoughts of a specific sect the basis of discussion, **we have made an effort to clarify in a general and complete way the ruling of Kufr and Islaam.** Now, all praise be to Allaah, this book contains all the necessary aspects regarding the matter of Kufr and Islaam and it is sufficient to remove doubts.

---

[1] The Research Court in Panjab were asked questions regarding Muslim, Kaafir, Islaam and Kufr

والله سبحانه وتعالى ولى التوفيق وهو به حقيق

When Pakistan was formed, together with the discussion of Kufr and Islaam, the doors to another discussion opened. That is, the differentiation between nations in the world. Should it be on the basis of lineage, country, colour or language, or should it be on the basis of religion, i.e. Kufr and Islaam. After the formation of Pakistan this matter came forward in various ways. Therefore, in the beginning, a comprehensive discussion in the light of the Qur’aan and Hadith has also been brought.

Muhammad Shafi’ *(May Allaah forgive him)*
Karachi
Jumad al Awwal 1373
January 1952

Introduction

The principle that separates one nation from another

In essence, all mankind was one nation and one religion. They were born from one set of parents. In the beginning, the viewpoints, beliefs and principles of social life and business were also one. All of them believed in one Allaah and they understood His commands as compulsory to follow – the commands that reached them through the Rasul. Then, as they spread in the world and they went far from each other. They increased and this separation covered from east to west and from north to south, and they covered all corners of the earth. Then there arose a difference in the principles of social life and business. Differences arose in language and in day to day speech. Together with this, beliefs and viewpoints were affected. In place of worshipping Allaah, the door to worshipping creation opened. The creation of Allaah split into various nations and fighting on the basis of nationalism began. Together with the fighting amongst nations, a need arose to help and assist. So, various groups, upon various principles began to get allies and aides.

The world was understood to be four nations in the beginning, based on the four directions, east, west, south and north. Then on the basis of the seven continents, the nations were taken to be seven. (Milal wan Nihal of Shahristaani p.2) Then, on the basis of lineage and race, a

person gathered his nation and fought other tribes and bloodlines.

Some made their nations based on geographical boundaries and country or on the basis of language. Those that were different on the basis of these criteria were understood to be separate and enemies. Some made the basis of the nation to be viewpoint and beliefs and made those who worship creation to be one nation and made those who worship Allaah to be the enemy.

چوں ندیدند حقیقت ره افسانہ زدند

In every era and in every nation, Allaah sent His Ambiyaa’ for the success and salvation for the son of Aadam.

وان من امة إلا خلا فيها نذير

In every nation (from our side) a warner had passed

The teaching of all these Ambiyaa’ was that leave all this made up differences and become one nation again. Leave out worshipping creation and worship only one Allaah. Take lineage, geographical borders and language differences to be signs of the complete power of Allaah and only in order to create ease in the society they serve as causes and blessings. Do not make them a basis for splitting the nations. Some people accepted and the wretched ones rejected and opposed. By adopting this path the war between Kufr and Islaam began.

Our Rasul, the Final Messenger □ also brought this message in accordance to the Sunnat of all the Ambiyaa’. He spread it in the most effective way. On one side the Qur’aan stated that

lineage, country and language differences are signs of the power of Allaah and blessings of Allaah. By doing so, it also showed the correct place for it that they are causes in order to create ease in society. They are not reasons for splitting nations. Look at the following Qur'aanic verses:

وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ خَلْقُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالأَرْضِ وَاخْتِلافُ أَلْسِنَتِكُمْ وَأَلْوَانِكُمْ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لآيَاتٍ لِلْعَالِمِينَ

Also among His Aayaat is the creation of the heavens and the earth and the variety of your languages and colours. There are certainly Aayaat in this for those who have knowledge *[Surah Room 30:22]*

وَجَعَلْنَاكُمْ شُعُوبًا وَقَبَائِلَ لِتَعَارَفُوا

And made you into various families and tribes so that you may recognise each other *[Surah Hujuraat 49:13]*

On the other hand, the Qur'aan establishes the call to the eternal oneness. The verse before the above quoted one states,

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِنْ ذَكَرٍ وَأُنْثَى

O people! We have certainly created you from a single male and female *[Surah Hujuraat 49:13]*

خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا

Who created you from a single soul, created its spouse from it *[Surah Nisaa' 4:1]*

In his farewell Hajj, while delivering the sermon, Rasulullaah (SAW) said this when discussing the Islaamic way and its basic principles,

ايها الناس ربكم واحد لا فضل لعربى على عجمى ولا لعجمى على عربى ولا لاحمر على اسود ولا لاسود على احمر إلا بالتقوى ان اكرمكم عند الله اتقاكم

> O people, your Rabb is One. There is no virtue of an Arab over a non Arab and no virtue of a non Arab over an Arab. Similarly, there is no superiority of a white person over a black person or a black person over a white person, except on account of Taqwa. Indeed the most honoured among you in the sight of Allaah is the one who has the most Taqwa.

In summary, the summary of the call of Rasulullaah (SAW) in this matter was that the world that is involved in splitting the nations and nationalism should once again come onto being a single, unified, proper nation which was the inheritance of their great-grandfather Hadhrat Aadam (AS).

Two paths were chosen for this,

First: the incorrect foundations of the division of nations, i.e. lineage, language and national principles made by people were made baseless and refuted at once. This is because if nations are split according to these foundations and the division of man is accepted, then this goes against logic that on the basis of land or family – which are involuntary and weak reasons, a person should be understood to be of another nation in national and communal matters.

Secondly, if the division of the unified nation of man were accepted, then they cannot be removed at any time or under any condition. Whichever person is born into an Arab family or non Arab family, it is not within his choice to be born into another family. Similarly, the person born in Asia cannot be

born a second time in Europe. In summary, these geographical, national, language and lineage divisions are based on much wisdom. No one has the capacity to erase them and no intelligent person can strive to remove them. It is necessary that these characteristics are taken on their correct platform such that they only exist for ease in society and in business dealings. The division of nations has no relation to them.

Second: the call of unity was that the principle of dividing nations based on viewpoints and beliefs is accepted. This means that those who believe in Allaah and those who reject him cannot join and be one nation. Undoubtedly, those who deny Allaah and His Rasul are separate from those that believe. They will be classified as another religion and another nation. The Qur'aan states the following regarding this principle,

خلقكم فمنكم كافر ومنكم مؤمن

He has created you, some of you are disbelievers and
some of you are believers

Another place states,

إنا هديناه السبيل إما شاكرا وإما كفورا

We guided him to the path, so he is either grateful or
ungrateful

In one place, based on this difference of viewpoint and belief, one group is called the 'Group of Allaah' and the other 'The group of Shaytaan'.

In summary, the difference of belief and viewpoint is accepted as the basic cause of division of nations. In order to remove this splitting, spreading and propagating the proper principles of worshipping Allaah and true beliefs and baseless beliefs like worshipping creation or rejecting Allaah and His Rasul - and their destructive effect in this world and in the Aakhirat are explained and thereby the creation of Allaah resorts to ways in order to be saved from it. Similarly, no aspect of advice was left out, through which the wretched going to destruction have not been stopped.

However, many unfortunate and wretched people take this advice and good counsel to be enmity. They will then become ready for fighting and war. The result of this is that the war between Islaam and Kufr erupts.

Now, if someone wants to finish off this war there are only two paths. One is that those who worship Allaah and the people of truth leave their viewpoint and throw down their weapons in front of the rejecters and the disbelievers. They would also hand over the creation of Allaah to the rejecters of Allaah, i.e. in other words, a merciful doctor becomes helpless regarding the incorrect actions of the patient and gives him poison personally.

The other form would be that those who reject Allaah stop their incorrect actions. The first of the two paths is not logical and the second is not within one’s choice.

Therefore, this difference of Kufr and Islaam is bound to remain until those who reject Allaah and His Rasul either come to their senses or are destroyed.

The summary is that the real call of Islaam is that of a single, proper nation that is not based on nationalism and language foundations, but it is based on authentic principles and true beliefs in which one does not oppose Allaah and His messengers. Therefore, those who separated themselves from this unified nation will be called a separate nation and a separate religion. From here did the two nations view come up and it caused the formation of Pakistan.

The war for freedom was going on in India for some time but some of those at the forefront formed an incorrect viewpoint that was made up of opposing elements – light and darkness, Kufr and Islaam. This viewpoint was regarding a unified nation but was illogical and could not be put into action. A few divinely scholars reminded the Muslims of the viewpoint of two nations at that time and they always did so but the call was not heard at the time. Finally, the plough of the war for freedom was moving when a group of Muslims adopted the view of this correct two nation theory and they made it the foundation and came into the field of action.

Every resident of Pakistan, in fact all the Muslims of the world should always be grateful to Hakeem ul Ummat Thanwi (RA) and the head leader and from amongst his friends, Shaykh ul Islaam Hadhrat Maulana Uthmani (RA) who showed the Muslims the correct path and the result of this was that Allaah (SWT) gave them a free, independent state.

The summary of this discussion is that the causes for separating one nation from another in the world have been understood to be different things. However, through its teachings, Islaam has clarified that there is only one principle for differentiating and dividing nations, i.e. it can only be on

the basis of believing in Allaah or not believing in Allaah. This is Islaam or Kufr. There is nothing else that will separate man into different groups. This is the end of the introduction. The actual objective of the booklet follows herewith.

والله الموفق والمعين

The definition of Imaan and Kufr

It is apparent that believing in Allaah means obeying Him and not believing is disobedience. Then, the obedience of Allaah, i.e. recognising those things that He likes and dislikes and adopting the things He likes and staying away from those that He dislikes. In this world it is generally impossible that a person stays and a messenger from Allaah (SWT) does not come to show and differentiate between that which is liked by Allaah and that which He dislikes. This is because only through his logic, man cannot differentiate between the likes and dislikes of his own father, brother, son or friend until the person does not make it apparent through his speech or through his way of action. So, Allaah (SWT) - Whose being and attributes are above the senses of man – how can man come to know from his logic what is liked by Allaah and what is disliked by Him? This is the wisdom behind sending the Ambiyaa’ to the world.

In summary, there is only one way of believing in Allaah in this world and that is to accept with the heart and tongue the guidance brought by His messengers. This is Islaam. Rejection of this guidance is Kufr.

The greatest foundational matter in religion is Imaan and Kufr. That is why the first chapter of the Qur’aan (Surah Baqarah)

has explained this subject matter in its very first verses, **in fact, it has split the entire world into three groups. Believers, disbelievers and hypocrites.** The first four verses of Surah Baqarah deal with the believers, the next two are about the disbelievers and the next thirteen verses discuss the condition of the hypocrites. In reality, these three groups are two because in essence the disbelievers and the hypocrites are one group. However, due to the fact that the apparent form of the hypocrites is different from the disbelievers, they have been mentioned separately. On account of the fact that this group is more dangerous for Islaam and the Muslims, therefore their condition is mentioned in greater detail, in thirteen verses. They total nineteen verses. A number of them are presented below with the translation,

الٓمّٓ (١) ذٰلِکَ الْکِتٰبُ لَا رَیْبَ ۛۚ فِیْہِ ۛۚ ہُدًی لِّلْمُتَّقِیْنَ (٢) الَّذِیْنَ یُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِالْغَیْبِ وَیُقِیْمُوْنَ الصَّلٰوۃَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنٰہُمْ یُنْفِقُوْنَ (٣) وَالَّذِیْنَ یُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِمَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَیْکَ وَمَآ اُنْزِلَ مِنْ قَبْلِکَ ۚ وَ بِالْاٰخِرَۃِ ہُمْ یُوْقِنُوْنَ (۴) اُولٰٓئِکَ عَلٰی ہُدًی مِّنْ رَّبِّہِمْ * وَ اُولٰٓئِکَ ہُمُ الْمُفْلِحُوْنَ (۵)

Alif Laam Meem. There is no doubt in this Book. In it is guidance for those with Taqwa. Those who have Imaan in the unseen, who establish Salaah and who spend from what We have provided for them. Those who believe in what has been revealed to you and what has been revealed before you and they are convinced about the Aakhirah. These are the ones who are on guidance from their Rabb and they are the successful ones.

اِنَّ الَّذِیْنَ کَفَرُوْا سَوَآ ءٌ عَلَیْہِمْ ءَاَنْذَرْتَہُمْ اَمْ لَمْ تُنْذِرْہُمْ لَا یُؤْمِنُوْنَ (۶) خَتَمَ اللہُ عَلٰی قُلُوْبِہِمْ وَعَلٰی سَمْعِہِمْ ؕ وَعَلٰی اَبْصَارِہِمْ غِشَاوَۃٌ ۫ وَّلَہُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِیْمٌ (۷)

Verily, it makes no difference to the Kaafiroon whether you warn them or do not warn them; they will still not have Imaan. Allaah has placed a seal upon their hearts and upon their hearing, while there is a veil over their eyes. Theirs shall be a terrible punishment.

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ یَّقُوْلُ اٰمَنَّا بِاللہِ وَ بِالْیَوْمِ الْاٰخِرِ وَمَا ہُمْ بِمُؤْمِنِیْنَ ۘ(۸)

Among people there are those who say, We believe in Allaah and in the Final Day, whereas they are not Mu'mineen

Four verses until 'the successful ones' explains the believers. After this, until 'terrible punishment' explains the disbelievers. After this, from 'Among people' the explanation regarding the hypocrites begins. In it the definitions of Imaan, Kufr, Mu'mineen, Kaafir and Munaafiq (hypocrite) are mentioned. The first four verses regarding the believers, first 'believer' and the summary of Imaan is mentioned. 'Those who have Imaan in the unseen', *[Tarjumaan ul Qur'aan]*.

Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (RA)said that 'unseen' in this place means all the beliefs that are cannot be seen by man like angels, Qiyaamat, Jannah, Jahannam, the bridge of Siraat and the scales of justice etc. *[Tafseer Ibn Katheer, Khaazin etc]*

In this summary, by bringing the word 'unseen', there could be indication that their belief in that which is present and absent is the same. They are not like the group of hypocrites

opposite to them whose condition is explained in the next verse that 'when they meet those who have Imaan, they say, We have Imaan! But when they are alone with their devils, they say, We are really with you.'

The summary of Imaan is defined completely in the third verse, in the following words, (وَالَّذِيۡنَ يُؤۡمِنُوۡنَ بِمَاۤ اُنۡزِلَ اِلَيۡکَ وَمَاۤ اُنۡزِلَ مِنۡ قَبۡلِکَ ۚ وَ بِالۡاٰخِرَةِ ہُمۡ يُوۡقِنُوۡنَ ؕ), i.e. those people who believe in the book revealed to Rasulullaah (SAW) and the Shari'ah and they believe in the revelation and Shari'ah that came to the Ambiyaa' before him. They also have conviction in the Aakhirat.

The first part of Imaan which is to believe in Allaah, there was no need understood to clearly state it (believing in Allaah) because when one does not have Imaan in Allaah then there is no meaning of bringing Imaan in any of His messengers or revelation. In the end of this Surah, when the explanation is given of the purport of Imaan, then belief in Allaah is clearly mentioned in the following words,

اٰمَنَ الرَّسُوۡلُ بِمَاۤ اُنۡزِلَ اِلَيۡہِ مِنۡ رَّبِّہٖ وَالۡمُؤۡمِنُوۡنَ ؕ كُلٌّ اٰمَنَ بِاللّٰهِ وَمَلٰٓئِکَتِہٖ وَكُتُبِہٖ وَرُسُلِہٖ ۟ لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيۡنَ اَحَدٍ مِّنۡ رُّسُلِہٖ ۟

The famous 'Imaan Mujmal' and 'Imaan Mufassal' among the masses are all probability based on this. Imaan Mujmal has been taken from the first verse of Surah Baqarah and Imaan Mufassal from this final verse. So, from the verses mentioned, 3 foundational principles are learnt.

1. To have Imaan in Allaah
2. To have Imaan in the revelation that came upon Rasulullaah (SAW) and all the previous Ambiyaa’
3. To have Imaan in the Aakhirat.

These 3 are in reality the essence of Imaan and the rest are subsidiary aspects.

Imam Ghazaali (RA) has written in (فيصل التفرقة في الاسلام الزندقة),

اصول الايمان ثلثة الايمان بالله وبرسوله وباليوم الآخرة وما عداه فروع

The principles of Imaan are 3. Having Imaan in Allaah, having Imaan in His Rasul and having Imaan in Qiyaamat. Besides this, all matters are subsidiary.

If someone wants to make these principles even more summarised, then in ‘Imaan in the Rasul’ all the other principles will come. This is because as long as a person does not have Imaan in Allaah, he cannot have Imaan in His Rasul. If he has Imaan in the Rasul, then Imaan in the Day of Qiyaamat is automatically included. This is because Imaan in the Rasul means Imaan in all the guidance that the Rasul presented. It is quite apparent that in all these aspects, one of the great ones is affirmation of the Day of Qiyaamat. Therefore, the Imams of Islaam have defined Imaan in this way,

هو تصديق النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم فيما علم مجيئه بالضرورة

Imaan is verifying the Rasul (SAW) in everything that is proven clearly and unequivocally from him

A beneficial point regarding the finality of Nubuwwah

In the definition of Imaan and Mu’min in this verse, a subtle way is also shown that the chain of Nubuwwah and Risaalat

and revelation has been completed upon Rasulullaah (SAW). This is because together with instruction to believe in the revelation sent upon Rasulullaah (SAW), there is only instruction to believe in the Ambiyaa' and the revelation sent upon them, there is no mention of any Ambiyaa' after him. It is quite apparent that if there was some Nabi having a Shari'ah to sent after him, then just as it is a part of Imaan to believe in the revelation sent to the previous Ambiyaa', similarly, it would be necessary to mention the Ambiyaa' to come later. In fact, it would be even more necessary to mention the Ambiyaa' to come later compared to the previous Ambiyaa' because the previous Ambiyaa' have been mentioned in the Qur'aan and in the explanation and instruction of Rasulullaah (SAW), it has come even more. There was no danger of the Ummah going astray regarding this matter.

In contrast to the Nabi that was to be sent in future that the Ummah is not aware of his condition and signs and they will have to face him without any means. In addition, the salvation or destruction of the Ummah would be based on believing or disbelieving him. In such conditions, it would be obligatory upon the final book of Allaah and the merciful Nabi to clearly mention all the conditions and signs of the Nabi to come in such a way that no doubt or confusion would remain. Then, there would clear laws commanding the Ummah to believe in him and upon his revelation stated repeatedly in the Qur'aan and Hadith.

However, instead of this happening, wherever the principles of Imaan are mentioned, then the previous Ambiyaa' and belief in the revelation sent upon them have been mentioned to be a part of Imaan and there is no mention of any Nabi or Rasul to come later on or any revelation that is to come upon

him. Then, not only one place, but more than 10 verses of the Qur'aan deal with this subject in which there is emphasis to believe in the revelation sent upon the previous Ambiyaa', **there is no mention of any revelation or Nabi to come later on.**

This is clear testimony of the Qur'aan that after Rasulullaah (SAW) no Nabi will be sent. Hadhrat 'Isa (RA)will come in the end times – he was sent before and the Ummah of Muhammad (SAW) believe in him already. Therefore, no one can claim that he is the Nabi of the Ummah and revelation comes to him and make himself a basis of salvation.

والله الموفق والمعين

The definition of a Mu'min and a Kaafir

Although a brief discussion of this has passed under the first topic, it is discussed clearly with explanation here. It is based on the same verses quoted under the first topic. Due to the fact that in the discussion of Kufr and Islaam, a few terms are used, therefore the definitions of these words are also written here,

Definitions

Imaan:

The verification from the heart of everything brought by Rasulullaah (SAW) and is established explicitly and clearly. This is on condition that one testifies to obedience as well.

Islaam:

Obedience to Allaah and His Rasul (SAW) on condition that one has Imaan as well, i.e. there is verification from the heart present.

Kufr:

To reject or deny any aspect in which it is necessary to verify with the heart in Imaan.

Mu'min:

The person who verifies from the heart everything proven explicitly and clearly from Rasulullaah (SAW) on condition that he states this with the tongue and testifies to obedience.

Muslim:

The person who testifies to obeying Allaah and His Rasul (SAW) on condition that he verifies this from the heart as well.
Kaafir:

The one who rejects from the heart or belies with the tongue any of the above mentioned things.

The difference between Islaam, Imaan, Muslim and Mu'min

As a quality, Imaan refers to verifying with the heart. Islaam refers to obedience. The place of Imaan is the heart and the place of Islaam is the heart, limbs and organs. However, in the Shari'ah, Imaan is not accepted without Islaam and Islaam is not accepted without Imaan, i.e. simply verifying Allaah and His Rasul in the heart will not be accepted in the Shari'ah until it is made apparent on the tongue and one does not testify to obedience. Testifying to obedience will not be acceptable until

one does not verify/believe in Allaah and His Rasul (SAW) in the heart.

This discussion basically means that in terms of the lexical meaning, Imaan and Islaam have two separate meanings and in the Qur'aan and Hadith, based on the lexical difference between Imaan and Islaam their differences are mentioned. However, in accordance to the clear text of the Qur'aan and Hadith, **it is also known that no Imaan is acceptable without Islaam and no Islaam is acceptable without Imaan.** This subject matter has been mentioned by some research scholars in this way that the journey of Islaam and Imaan is the same.

The difference is the beginning and end point. Imaan begins in the heart and ends on the apparent limbs and Islaam begins from the apparent limbs and ends in the heart. If the verification of the heart does not reach apparent outward testimony, then that verification or Imaan is not acceptable. Similarly, if the testimony does not reach verification in the heart, then that Islaam is not acceptable. [From the teachings of Allamah Maulana Anwar Shah Kashmiri (RA)

Now that the lexical and Shar'i definition of Imaan has been specified, the purport of Mu'min and Muslim is also apparent. Shaykh ul Islaam Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Uthmani (RA) has written on this in detail in his commentary on Sahih Muslim. He has written the research of Imam Ghazaali (RA) and Imam Subki (RA) (which has just passed). A few sentences of Imam Subki (RA) are presented below,

الاسلام موضوع للانقياد الظاهر مشروطا فيه الايمان والايمان موضوع للتصديق الباطن مشروطا فيه القول عند الامكان . فتح الملهم ج ١ ص ١٥١

Islaam refers to apparent obedience and submission. However, Imaan is conditional in it. Imaan refers to internal

verification. However, it is conditional to utter it verbally at the time when possible.

Shaykh Kamaal ud Deen Ibn Humaam (RA) - the commentator of Hidaayah says in his book on beliefs that is reliable and authoritative and its commentary Musaamarah that the Ummah of Muhammad (SAW) is unanimous upon this. His words are,

وقد اتفق اهل الحق وهم فريقا الاشاعرة والحنفية على تلازم الايمان والاسلام بمعنى انه لا ايمان يعتبر بلا اسلام وعكسه اى لا اسلام يعتبر بدون ايمان فلا ينفك احدهما عن الاخر . ج ٢ ص ١٨٦

The people of truth are unanimous – and they are the Ashaa'irah and the Hanafiyyah – that Imaan and Islaam are indispensible to each other, i.e. Imaan is not acceptable without Islaam or vice-versa, i.e. Islaam is not acceptable without Imaan. They cannot be separated from each other.

Undeniable/Explicit proof

That which has reached us from Rasulullaah (SAW) in Tawaatur form is proven explicitly, like the Qur'aan, the number of Salaat, the number of Rak'aat and the method of Ruku' and Sajdah. The details of Azaan, Zakaat, Hajj with its many details, the finality of Nubuwwah upon Rasulullaah (SAW) etc.

The meaning of Tawaatur is that from Rasulullaah (SAW) until us, through every era, the narrators from Rasulullaah (SAW) in different parts of the world were so many that it is preposterous to assume that they all united upon something incorrect or lies.

Clear proof

This is called Daroori or Bid Dharoora by the juro-consultants and Mutakallimeen. It refers to being together with Tawaatur, famous in such a way that the masses and the special class are aware of it, like Salaat, fasting, Zakaat and Hajj being obligatory. Similarly, Azaan being Sunnat and Nubuwwah coming to an end upon Rasulullaah (SAW) etc.

The necessary parts of Deen

All those things that are proven through Tawaatur from Rasulullaah (SAW) and are proven with clarity and are famous that every person is aware of them, according to the terminology of the juro-consultants and Mutakallimeen, they are called the necessary aspects of Deen.

Note :

Imaan refers to verifying and accepting many things that were mentioned in the definition above. However, in Kufr, it is not necessary that a person rejects or belies all of them. **If a person rejects or belies a single one of them it will be Kufr, no matter if he accepts all the others with a true heart.** The reason for this is that Imaan and Islaam have one reality. There are many types of Kufr. Two of the foundational types are mentioned in the verses of Surah Baqarah that were quoted. One is apparent Kufr and the other is Kufr e Nifaaq. The other types will be explained with the details later on.

The types of Kufr and Kaafir

The real subject matter of this booklet is this, as explained in the preface.

From the details mentioned before, we learnt that Kufr refers to belying the Rasul. Then, there are a few forms of belying. On account of the differences of these forms, a number of types of Kufr arise. Imam Ghazaali (RA) has discussed this in his work Faysal ut Tafriqah bayn al Islaam waz Zandaqa, also in Al Iqtisaad fil I'tiqaad. Hadhrat Shah Abdul Aziz (RA) has discussed this in his Fataawa and Imam Baghawi (RA) has discussed in detail in the Tafseer of (ان الذين كفروا سواء عليهم الآية). Similarly, there are details in the reliable works of Aqaa'id and Belief like Sharh Mawaaqif and Sharh Maqaasid.

The summary of these types of belying are:

1. One type of belying is that a person clearly does not accept Rasulullaah (SAW) as the messenger of Allaah, like the idol worshippers, Jews and Christians.
2. The second type is that after accepting, a person clearly states that one of his statements are wrong or is lies, i.e. a person believes in some of his advices and belies others.
3. The third is that a person rejects and says that a statement or action explicitly proven from Rasulullaah (SAW) is not the statement or action of Rasulullaah (SAW). In reality, this is also belying the Rasul.
4. The fourth form is that a person accepts the statement and action and interprets the purport that is against the clear text of the Qur'aan and Hadith and he chooses some purport made up himself. This form of

Kufr and belying is found to be done mostly by the claimants of Islaam and by those doing the outstanding features of Islaam. On account of this most people come across many wrongs. This is especially so when it is looked at that rejection with interpretation is not part of belying according to the unanimity of the scholars and such a person cannot be called a Kaafir. It is quite apparent that the Mulhideen definitely take the support of some interpretation.

Therefore this type of explanation and clarification is more necessary so that the difference between interpretation and Ilhaad can be known. It could also be learnt that in the place of interpretation, interpretation does not cause Kufr but the interpretation of Kufr and Zandaqah causes Kufr – this is unanimous. Therefore this subject is written in detail.

Kufr, Zandaqah and Ilhaad

This fourth type of belying is called Ilhaad in the terminology of the Qur'aan. In the Hadith it is called Ilhaad and Zandaqah.

الذين يلحدون في آياتنا لا يخفون علينا أفمن يلقى في النار خير أم من ياتى آمنا يوم القيامة الآية عن ابن عمر قال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول سيكون في هذه الامة مسخ الا وذلك في المكذبين بالقدر والزنديقية . أخرجه الامام احمد في مسنده ١٠٨/٢ وقال في الخصائص سنده صحيح وفي منتخب كنز العمال ٥٠/٦ مرفوعا ما يفسرها

Those who do Ilhaad in our verses are not hidden from us. Is the person who is thrown into Jahannam better or the one who will come with safety on the Day of Qiyaamat? It is narrated from Hadhrat Ibn Umar (RA) that he heard

Rasulullaah (SAW) saying that soon there will be disfiguring in this Ummah. Hear well, it will be those who belie Taqdeer and amongst the Zindeeqs. Imam Ahmad (RA) narrated this in his Musnad and in Khasa'is it is said that its chain is authentic. In Muntakhab Kanz ul Ummaal vol.2 p.50 there is a Marfu' narration that explains it. Imam Bukhaari (RA) has written a special chapter in Sahih Bukhaari regarding this type of belying. (باب قتل من ابى قبول الفرائض وما نسبوا الى الردة) In this chapter, this type of belying is called Irtidaad (turning renegade). Hadhrat Shah Waliullaah Dehlawi (RA) has written in Musawwa the commentary of Mu'atta regarding this type of belying,

وان اعترف به ظاهرا ولكن يفسر بعض ما ثبت من الدين ضرورة بخلاف ما فسره الصحابة والتابعون واجمعت عليه الامة فهو الزنديق كما اذا اعترف بان القرآن حق وما فيه من ذكر الجنة والنار حق لكن المراد بالجنة الابتهاج الذي يحصل بسبب الملكات المحمودة والمراد بالنار هى الندامة التى تحصل بسبب الملكات المذمومة وليس في الخارج جنة ولا نار فهو زنديق . مسوى شرح مؤطا ٢ /١٣٠

If a person testifies to its apparent purport but some parts of Deen that are proven, he explains it in such a way that is against that of the Sahabah, Ta'bieen and the consensus of the Ummah, then he is a Zindeeq. For example, he testifies that the Qur'aan is true and Jannah and Jahannam mentioned therein is also correct but Jannah means that happiness and joy that is created from good character and Jahannam means regret that is attained from evil character. In this way, there is no Jannah and Jahannam. This person is a Zindeeq.

The difference between Ta'weel (interpretation) and Tahreef (interpolation)

ثم التأويل تاويلان تاويل لا يخالف قاطعا من الكتاب والسنة واتفاق الامة وتاويل يصادم ما ثبت بقاطع فذلك الزندقة فكل من انكر رؤية الله تعالى يوم القيامة او انكر

عذاب القبر وسؤال المنكر والنكير وانكر الصراط والحساب سواء قال لا اثق بهؤلاء الرواة او قال اثق بهم لكن الحديث ماؤل ثم ذكر تاويلا فاسدا لم يسمع من قبله فهو الزنديق او قال ان النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم خاتم النبوة ولكن معنى هذا الكلام انه لا يجوز ان يسمى بعده احد بالنبى واما معنى النبوة وهو كون الانسان مبعوثا من الله تعالى الى الخلق مفترض الطاعة معصوما من الذنوب ومن البقاء على الخطاء فيما يرى فهو موجودة في الائمة بعده فذلك الزنديق . تصانيف حضرت شاه ولى الله

Then there are two types of Ta'weel. One Ta'weel is the one that does not contradict the Qur'aan, Sunnah and consensus of the ummah. One Ta'weel is the one that is in conflict with a clear ruling of one of the above mentioned things. This second type is Zandaqah. So the person who denies the sighting of Allaah, denies the Day of Qiyaamat or the punishment of the grave or he denies the questioning of Munkar and Nakeer or he denies the Siraat or reckoning, it does not matter whether he says that he does not rely on the narrators or he says that the narrators are reliable but the meaning of the Hadith is something else. **Saying this, he makes such a Ta'weel that was never heard before. Such a person is a Zindeeq.**

Or a person says that Rasulullaah (SAW) is the final Nabi but it means that it is not permissible to name someone 'Nabi' after him. However, the actual meaning and purport of nubuwwah is that person sent by Allaah to the creation, it is obligatory to obey him and he is sinless. He is also pure from this that if there is something incorrect in his opinion, then he remains on it. If a person says that this meaning and purport is found in the Imams that came after him, this person will be a Zindeeq.

This belying of the Rasul (the 4th form), called Zandaqah and Ilhaad is in reality a type of hypocrisy. It is worse and more dangerous than general hypocrisy. When the chain of revelation came to an end after the demise of Rasulullaah (SAW) and there is no clear, definite way of coming to know if hypocrisy and Kufr is hidden in the heart of a person, so a hypocrite now will be those who claim Islaam and together with this they say or do certain actions that reveals the Kufr hidden within. This is an example of Zandaqah and Ilhaad.

It is for this reason that Umdatul Qaari commentary of Bukhaari and Tafseer Ibn Kathir mention the following statement of Imam Maalik (RA) under the verse 'In the hearts is a sickness',

المنافق في عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم هو الزنديق اليوم . ابن كثير ٤٦/١

What this means is that after the demise of Rasulullaah (SAW), no matter how Kufr and hypocrisy is hidden in the heart of a person, due to the fact that we do not have any way of coming to know of it, we cannot call him a Kaafir or hypocrite. Now there is only one type of Nifaaq present, it is called Zandaqah, i.e. together with claiming Islaam and being restricted to its laws, having beliefs of Kufr or to make some baseless interpretation in the necessary aspects of Deen and to interpolate its collective meaning.

Hujjatul Islaam Imam Ghazaali (RA) (an accepted Imam of the Ummah), and all the Islaamic groups accept his leadership. Khuda Bakhsh Qaadiyaani has written a book Asl Mustafa in which he enumerated the Mujaddideen. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad heard every word of the book from him and verified it,

on p.164 Imam Ghazaali (RA) is classified as the Mujaddid of the 5th century.

Thinking of the great harm and the delicacy of this matter, Imam Ghazaali (RA) wrote a book ‘At Tafruqah Bayn al Islaam waz Zandaqah on the matter of Kufr and Imaan. In the light of Qur’aan, Sunnah, narrations and logic, he clarified the difference between Ta’weel and Ilhaad. He states that the Zindeeqs and Mulhids have no place in Islaam. They are definitely out of the fold of Islaam even though they call themselves Muslims. Taking into consideration the caution that must be taken in calling someone who claims Islaam to be Kaafir, Imam Ghazaali (RA) has mentioned a rule and bequest. It is mentioned below with its translation,

فصل : اعلم ان شرح ما يكفر به وما لا يكفر به يستدعى تفصيلا طويلا يفتقر الى ذكر كل المقالات والمذاهب وذكر شبهة كل واحد ودليله ووجه بعده عن الظاهر ووجه تاويله وذلك لا تحويه مجلدات وليس يسع لشرح ذلك اوقاتى فاقتنع الآن بوصيه وقانون اما الوصية فان تكف لسانك عن اهل القبلة ما امنك ما داموا قائلين لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله غير منا قضين لها والمناقضة تجويزهم الكذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعد راور غير عذر فان التكفير فيه خطر والسكوت لا خطر فيه واما القانون فهو ان تعلم ان النظريات قسمان قسم يتعلق باصول العقائد وقسم يتعلق بالفروع واصول الايمان بالله وبرسوله وباليوم الآخر وما عداه فروع واعلم ان الخطاء في اصل الامانة وتعينها وشروطها وما يتعلق بها لا يوجب شيئ منه تكفيرا فقد انكر ابن كيسان اصل وجوب الامامة ولا يلزم تكفيره يلتفت الى قوم يعظمون امر الامامة ويجعلون الايمان بالامام مقرونا بالايمان بالله وبرسوله والى خصومهم المكفرين لهم بمجرد مذهبهم في الامامة وكل ذلك اسراف اذ ليس في واحد من القولين تكذيب الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم اصلا ومهما وجد التكذيب وجب التكفير وان كان في الفروع فلو قال قائل مثلا البيت الذي بمكة ليس هى

الكعبة التى امر الله بحجها فهذا كفر اذ ثبت تواترا عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لذلك البيت بانه الكعبة ينفعه ينفعه انكاره بل يعلم قطعا انه معاند في انكاره (الا ان يكون قريب عهد بالاسلام ولم يتواتر عنده ذلك وكذلك من نسب عائشة رضى الله عنها الى الفاحشة وقد نزل القرآن ببرآئتها فهو كافر لان هذا وامثاله لا يمكن الا بتكذيب او انكار والتوائر ينكره الانسان بلسانه ولا يمكنه ان يجهله بقلبه نعم لو انكر ما ثبت باخبار الآحاد فلا يلزمه به الكفر ولو انكر ما ثبت بالاجماع فهذا فيه نظر لان معرفة كون الاجماع حجة مختلف فيه فهذا حكم الفروع واما الاصول الثلثة فكل ما لم يحتمل التاويل في نفسه وتواتر نقله ولم يتصور ان يقوم برهان على خلافه فخلافه تكذيب محض ومثاله ما ذكرناه من حشر الاجساد والجنة والنار واحاطة علم الله تعالى بتفاصيل الامور وما يتطرق اليه احتمال ولو بالمجاز البعيد فينظر فيه الى برهان فان كان قاطعا وجب القول به لكن ان كان في اظهاره مع العوام ضرر لقصور فهمهم فاظهاره بدعة وان لم يكن البرهان قاطعا يعلم ضرورة في الدين كنفى المعتزلة للرؤية عن البارى تعالى فهذا بدعة وليس يكفر واما ما يظهر له ضرر فيقع في محل الاجتهاد و النظر فيحتمل ان يكفر ويحتمل ان لا يكفر , ثم قال ...

ولا ينبغى ان نظن ان التكفير ونفيه ان يدرك قطعا في كل مقام بل التكفير حكم شرعى يرجع الى اباحة المال وسفك الدم والحكم بالخلود في النار فماخذه كماخذ سائر الاحكام الشرعية تارة يدرك بيقين وتارة بظن غالب ةتارة يتردد فيه ومهما حصل التردد فالتوقف في التكفير اولى والمبادرة الى التكفير انما يغلب على طباع من يغلب عليهم الجهل

ولا بد من التبيه بقاعدة اخرى فهو ان المخالف قد يخالف نصا متواترا ويزعم انه ماول ولكن تاويله لا انقداح له اصلا في اللسان لا على قرب ولا على بعد فذلك كفر وصاحبه مكذب وان كان يزعم انه ماؤل

It should be known in order to explain what things cause Kufr and what things do not. This demands great detail because there is a need to mention all the views and the

Madhaahib. In addition, its proof and its reason for being farfetched from the apparent and on account of its interpretation. This cannot be encompassed in a number of volumes, nor is there time available to me in order to explain it. Therefore, I suffice upon one law and upon a bequest.

Bequest:

The bequest is that you should stop your tongue from making Takfeer anyone of the Qiblah as long as possible, i.e. as long as a person says 'There is no deity but Allaah and Muhammad is the Rasul of Allaah'. Do not make Munaaqadah with him. The meaning of Munaaqadah is that he thinks is permissible to classify any command of Rasulullaah (SAW) to be incorrect or lies, whether he says this based on some reason or not. This is because there is danger in Takfeer and there is no danger in silence.

The law of Takfeer:

The law is that you should know that there are two types of viewpoints. One is that which is linked to the principles of Aqaa'id. The second is related to subsidiary matters. The principles of Imaan are 3. The first is to believe in Allaah, the second is to believe in His Rasul and the third is to believe in Qiyaamat. Whatever is besides this is subsidiary. It should be known that a mistake in the principle of Imaamat and in specifying and its conditions etc. does not necessitate Takfeer as is found in the Rawaafidh and Khawaarij. This is because Ibn Kaysaan has rejected the compulsion of Imaamat and it does not necessitate Takfeer of him. No attention will be given to that nation that understands the matter of Imaamat to be great and make it equal to believe in the Imam together with

believing in Allaah and His Rasul. No attention will be given to those who oppose them. Those who make Takfeer of them just because they have a difference of opinion in the ruling of Imaamat. All this is going beyond the boundaries because none of the two views necessitate belying Rasulullaah (SAW). Wherever belying is found, Takfeer will be necessary even though it is in a subsidiary matter. For example, a person says that the house that is in Makkah is not the Ka'bah that Allaah commanded one to make Hajj towards. This will be Kufr because the opposite of this is proven from Rasulullaah (SAW) with Tawaatur. If he rejects this and says that Rasulullaah (SAW)did not testify that that this house is the Ka'bah then his rejection will not benefit him, in fact his being adamant in his rejection will be known clearly, except if he is a new Muslim and this has not reached him with Tawaatur. **Similar will be the case with the person who accuses Hadhrat Ayesha radhiyallaahu anha, whereas the Qur'aan has announced her innocence, so such a person will also become a Kaafir.**

This is because such talk is not possible without belying and rejection. A person can reject something Tawaatur with his tongue but it is impossible that his heart is unaware. **Yes, if he rejects something proven from a Khabar e Waahid, then Kufr will not result.** If he rejects something proven by consensus then there is a need to ponder over it. This is because there is a difference of opinion whether consensus (ijmaa') is a proof. So its ruling will be subsidiary. Regarding the three principles, whatever does not have the possibility of interpretation and it is narrated and proven through Tawaatur and no other proof can be thought of against it, then going against it will be belying. The example is that which was mentioned, i.e. resurrection, Jannah, Jahannam and that the knowledge of Allaah encompasses everything.

Whatever among them has the status of possibility, even though if it is through a very far Majaaz, then the proof will be scrutinised. If the proof is clear, then it will be compulsory to have that view. However, if the masses are harmed by making it apparent on account of their deficient understanding, then it will be an innovation to make it apparent. If the proof is not clear like the Mu'tazilah reject seeing Allaah, it will be innovation, not Kufr. That whose harm is apparent, will be in the level of Ijtihaad. So, it is possible that Takfeer is made and it is possible that Takfeer is not made...

It is not appropriate that you think that for Takfeer and not making Takfeer it is necessary that it should be known with certainty at every place. Takfeer is a command of the Shari'ah. The result of it is that wealth becomes permissible and blood will be shed or the ruling of staying in hell fire will be necessitated. So, its nature is like the nature of other laws of the Shari'ah in that sometimes it is known through conviction, sometimes through overpowering thought and sometimes through reservation. When there are reservations it is better to keep silent about Takfeer. Being hasty in Takfeer overpowers the nature of those who are overpowered by ignorance.

It is also necessary to discuss one law. Sometimes the opposition is against a clear text that is Mutawaatir and he understands that he is taking the path of Ta'weel, **but his Ta'weel is such that there is no scope for it. Not a close or far Ta'weel on the tongue. This will be Kufr.** Such a person is a belier even though he understands that he is making Ta'weel.

Finally, he writes concerning other types of Ta'weel that are baseless,

فامثال هذا المقالات تكذيبات عبر عنها بالتاويلات

Such type of belying has been called Ta'weel.

From this detailed discussion of Imam Ghazaali (RA) it has become clear that making such baseless interpretations in the Qur'aan and Hadith that changes its collective meaning and going against the beliefs of the Ummah, a new purport is created, such Ta'weel also entails belying the Rasul and it being Kufr is apparent.

The testimony of the Imams of Islaam regarding Zandaqah being Kufr

The first and most powerful testimony is the consensus of the Sahabah (RA) that was done after the demise of Rasulullaah (SAW). Those who did not want to give Zakaat were classified as Murtad. They were unanimous on waging Jihaad against them, whereas all these people were performing Salaat, fasting and observing the signs of Islaam. **Just by rejecting one order, Zakaat, they were classified as Kaafir by the consensus of the Sahaabah (RA).**

Hafiz Ibn Taymiyyah (RA) writes,

وفيهم من الردة عن شرائع الاسلام بقدر ما ارتد عنه من شعائر الاسلام اذ كان السلف قد سموا مانعى الزكوة مرتدين مع كونهم يصومون ويصلون . فتاوى ابن تيمية ٤ /٢٩١

Turning renegade regarding one of the signs of Islaam is found in these people because the Salaf called them Murtad even though they performed Salaah and kept fast.

The second testimony is the consensus of the Sahabah (RA) upon the Kufr and Irtidaad of Musailamah Kadh dhaab and waging Jihaad against him. This is despite the fact that his entire group said the Kalimah. According to the history of Ibn Jareer Tabari vol.3 p.244, they said in their Azaan ‘I testify that Muhammad is the Rasul of Allaah’. They gave this testimony from the minarets and were punctual upon Salaat and fasting. However, they made interpretations of the verse of the finality of the prophet-hood and the Hadith ‘There is no Nabi after me’ going against the collective belief of the Ummah and thereby they believed that Musailamah Kadh dhaab is partner to Rasulullaah (SAW) in Nubuwwah.

The Sahabah (RA) classified them as Kaafir through agreement and consensus and understood it necessary to wage Jihaad against them. Under the leadership of Hadhrat Khaalid bin Waleed (RA), the great army of Sahabah (RA) left to wage Jihaad against them. 40000 equipped youngsters came out under Musailamah Kadh dhaab. The battle was very great. 1200 of the Sahabah (RA) were martyred and 28000 people of the army of Musailamah including Musailamah himself were killed.

[Taarikh Tabari]

Not one of the Sahabah (RA) rejected this and not one of them said that they recite the Kalimah, they are people of the Qiblah and how can they be called Kaafir? Not one of them had the concern that such a huge and powerful group of the Muslims will decrease. Therefore, in the general books of Aqaa’id this ruling has been termed a ruling based on consensus.

Jawharatut Tawheed explains,

ومن لمعلوم ضرورى حجد من ديننا يقتل كفرا ليس حد وقال شارحه ان هذا مجمع عليه وذكر ان الماتريدية يكفرون بعد هذا بالنكار القطعى وان لم يكن ضروريا

Whoever rejects any clear explicit ruling, and he should be killed on account of becoming a Kaafir. Not as punishment. In the commentary of this book it is written that the Ummah has consensus upon this and it is also written that the scholars of the Maturidis give the ruling of Kufr in general for rejecting an indisputable ruling, even though it may not be clear.

Hafiz Ibn Taymiyyah (RA), in his work Iqaamatut Daleel, has stated that Ijmaa' (consensus) is the greatest proof,

واجماعهم حجة قاطعة يجب اتباعها بل هى اوكدا لحجج وهى مقدمة على غيرها .
اقامة الدليل ٣ /١٣٠

The consensus of the Ummah is indisputable proof. It is compulsory to follow it, in fact, it is more emphasised than all the other proofs. It is given preference to rulings upon which there is no Ijmaa'.

The Imams of Islaam, the Mufassireen, Muhadditheen, juro-consultants and Mutakallimeen all state in a single voice that the necessary aspects of Deen, i.e. the definite and indisputable rulings of Islaam, to make some baseless interpretation in them and to take it out from the purport and form that is clear in the Qur'aan and Hadith and from the purport understood by majority of the Ummah, is in reality belying the Qur'aan, Hadith and beliefs of Islaam.

The famous and reliable work in beliefs 'Maqaasid' states in the definition of Kufr and Kaafir,

وان كان مع اعترافه بنبوة النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم واظهاره شعائر الاسلام يبطن عقائد هى كفر بالاتفاق خص باسم الزنديق

If someone is such that he attests to the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah (SAW) and despite making the signs of Islaam apparent, he hides such beliefs that are Kufr by consensus, then he is made special with the name of 'Zindeeq'

'Allamah Shaami (RA) explains this subject in Radd ul Muhtaar,

فان الزنديق يموه بكفره ويروج عقيدته الفاسدة ويخرجها في الصورة الصحيحة وهذا معنى ابطانه الكفر فلا ينافى الجهار والدعوى الى الضلال . ٣ /٢٩٦

A Zindeeq resorts to puzzling issues regarding his Kufr and gives vogue to his baseless beliefs. He takes them out in a correct form. This is the meaning of Ibtaan e Kufr. So it does not negate clear and open Kufr, nor does it negate calling towards deviation.

Hadhrat Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlawi (RA) writes in his Fataawa the following about the types of belying and Kufr,

ولا شبهة ان الايمان مفهومه الشرعى المعتبر به في كتب الكلام والعقائد والتفسير والحديث هو تصديق النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم فيما علم مجيئه ضرورة عما من شانه ذلك ليخرج الصبى والمجنون والحيوانات والكفر عدم الايمان عما من شانه ذلك التصديق فمفهوم الكفر هو عدم تصديق النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم فيما علم مجيئه ضرورة وهو بعينه ما ذكرنا من ان من انكر واحد من ضروريات الدين اتصف بالكفر نعم عدم التصديق له مراتب اربع فيحصل للكفر ايضا اقسام اربعة الاول كفر الجهل وهو تكذيب النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم صريحا فيما علم مجيئه بدمع العلم (اى في زعمه الباطل) بكونه عليه السلام كاذب في دعواه وهذا وهو كفر ابى جهل واضرابه والثانى كفر الجحود والعناد وهو تكذيبه مع العلم بكونه صادقا في دعواه وهو كفر اهل الكتاب لقوله تعالى الذين آتينهم الكتب يعرفونه كما يعرفون ابنائهم وقوله وجحدوا بها واستيقنتها انفسهم ظلما وعلوا وكفر ابليس من

هذا القبيل والثالث كفر الشك كما كان لاكثر المنافقين والرابع كفر التاويل وهو ان يحمل كلام النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم على غير محمله او على التقية ومراعاة المصالح ونحو ذلك ولما كان التوجه الى القبلة من خواص معنى الايمان سواء كان شاملة او غير شاملة عبروا عن اهل الايمان باهل القبلة كما ورد في الحديث نهيت عن قتل المصلين والمراد المؤمنين مع ان نص القرآن على ان اهل القبلة هم المصدقون بالنبى صلى الله عليه وسلم في جميع ما علم مجيئه وهو قوله تعالى وصد عن سبيل الله وكفر به والمسجد الحرام واخراج اهله منه اكبر عند الله . فتاوى عزيزى ١/٤٢

There is no doubt that the purport of Imaan according to the Shari'ah mentioned in the books of belief, Tafseer and Hadith are reliable. It is to verify Rasulullaah (SAW) in all those things narrated from him and is clearly known as such. This is upon the person that is worthy, i.e. children, mad people and animals are not included in this. Kufr refers to the absence of Imaan in such a person. So, Kufr means not verifying that which came from Rasulullaah (SAW).

This is exactly what we mentioned that the person who rejects a single necessary aspect of Deen will be said to have the quality of Kufr.

There are four stages of not verifying. Therefore four types of Kufr emerge.

The first is Kufr e Jahl. It is clear belying of that which Rasulullaah (SAW) brought, understanding that Rasulullaah (SAW) is a liar (according to this person's baseless thought) in his call. This is the Kufr of Abu Jahl etc.

The second is Kufr e Juhood and 'Inaad. This is despite understanding him to be true from the heart, he is belied. This is the Kufr of the Ahl e Kitaab as Allaah (SWT) states, 'those whom We gave the book to recognize him as they recognize

their sons'. Another place states, 'they have rejected although their hearts have conviction. This rejection, oppression is on account of pride and haughtiness'. The Kufr of Iblees is of this type.

The third Kufr is doubt as was the case with most of the hypocrites.

The fourth Kufr is Ta'weel. It is to apply the speech of Rasulullaah (SAW) to a place where it does not apply or to state that it is Taqiyya or taking into consideration expediency etc. Since seeing that facing the Qiblah is a specialty of Imaan, whether it is included or not, the people of Imaan call them the people of the Qiblah as the Hadith states that I have been prevented from killing those who perform Salaat and the meaning at this place is the Muslims. **In addition, the Qur'aan testifies that those of the Qiblah are those who verify all that which Rasulullaah (SAW) brought.** The clear text is 'to prevent from Allaah's way, to disbelieve in Him, the Masjidul Haraam and to expel its people from it is a far greater sin in the sight of Allaah.' Understand well.

Hafiz Ibn Qayyim (RA) has written in Shifa' ul 'Illeel about baseless Ta'weel,

ما في الشفاء العليل للحافظ ابن القيم رحمه الله والتاويل الباطل يتضمن تعطيل ما جاء به الرسول والكذب على المتكلم انه اراد ذلك المعنى فتضمن ابطال الحق وتحقيق الباطل ونسبه المتكلم الى ما لا يليق به من التلبيس والالغاز مع القول عليه بلا علم انه اراد هذا المعنى فالمتاول عليه ان يبين صلاحية اللفظ للمعنى الذي ذكره اولا واستعمال المتكلم له في ذلك المعنى في اكثر المواضع حتى اذا استعمله فيما يحتمل غيره يحمل على ما عهد منه استعماله فيه وعليه ان يقيم دليلا سالما عن

المعارض على الموجب بصرف اللفظ عن ظاهره وحقيقة الى عجارة واستعمارته والا كان خلك مجرد دعوى منه فلا يقبل

Baseless Ta'weel is included, that which renders ineffective that which the Ambiyaa' brought and lies upon the speaker in that he intends something. So this necessitates that truth is rendered void and something baseless is proven. Something is attributed to the speaker that is against his status, i.e. speaking puzzling and confusing things. In addition, a false accusation is levelled against him that he intends a particular meaning. So it is necessary upon the one who makes Ta'weel that he should prove that the word has the capacity to be used for that particular meaning that he mentions. Also, the speaker used it for that meaning in most places so that when the speaker uses it in another place that has another possible meaning, then it will be taken for the meaning in vogue.

He should also establish such a proof that has no opposition upon this that the apparent meaning is compulsory and it does not move to the Majaaz or Isti'aarah meaning, otherwise it is just a claim that is not worthy of acceptance.

The following is mentioned in Fataawa Ibn Taymiyyah:

ثم لو قدر انهم متاولون لم يكن تاويلهم سائغنا بل تاويل الخوارج ومانعى الزكوة اوحيه من تاويلهم اما الخوارج فانهم احياء اتباع القرآن وان ما خالفه من السنة لا يجوز العمل به اما مانعوا الزكوة فقد ذكروا انهم قالوا ان الله قال لنبيه فقط فليس علينا ان ندفعها لغيره فلم يكونوا يدفعونها لابى بكر ولا يخرجونها له ٢٩٧ /٤

If it is also accepted that these people are those who make Ta'weel, then their Ta'weel is not worthy of acceptance. In fact, the Ta'weel of the Khawaarij and those who stopped from giving Zakaat is closer and more worthy of acceptance.

This is because the Khawaarij claimed following the Qur'aan and leaving out that from the Sunnah which contradicts the Qur'aan. Those who rejected giving Zakaat said that Allaah (SWT) addressed Rasulullaah (SAW) by saying 'take sadaqah from their wealth'. This is directed to Rasulullaah (SAW). So there is no Zakaat obligatory on us from the side of someone not a Nabi. Therefore, they did not want to give Zakaat to Hadhrat Abu Bakr (RA).

وفي ١٨٥ وقد اتفق الصحابة والائمة بعدهم على قتال مانعى الزكوة وان كانوا يصلون الخمس ويصومون شهر رمضان وهؤلاء لم يكن لهم شبهة سائغة فلهذا كانوا مرتدين وهم يقاتلون على منعها وان اقرو بالوجوب كما امر الله

On p.85 it states that the Sahabah (RA) and the Imams agreed to wage Jihaad against those who stopped giving Zakaat even though they performed Salaat five times daily, fasted in Ramadhaan. They did not have any doubt. Therefore, they were renegades and Jihaad should be waged against them for stopping even though they attest to its compulsion as Allaah (SWT) commands.

وقال من ٦٩بغية المرتاد وانما القصد ههنا التبيه على ان عامة هذه التاويلات مقطوع ببطلانها وان الذي يتاوله او يسوغ تاويله فقد يقع في الخطاء في نظيره او فيه بل قد يكفر من تاويله

At this point, the objective is to point out that generally these interpretations are baseless and the one that makes them or thinks it permissible to make such interpretations, he will sometimes fall into error in it or the like of it, **in fact, the one who makes Ta'weel can sometimes become Kaafir.**

The following is written in Sharh Jam ul Jawami',

جاحد المجمع عليه من الدين بالضرورة كافر قطعا

The one who rejects something clearly proven through consensus becomes Kaafir.

Allamah Abdul Hakeem Siyalkoti has written in Khiyali Hashiya of Sharh Aqaid,

والتاويل في ضروريات الدين لا يدفع الكفر . حاشية خيالى

Making Ta'weel in the necessary aspects of Deen cannot save a person from Kufr

Shaykh Muyi ud Deen Ibn Arabi writes in Futuhaat Makkiyah,

التاويل الفاسد كالكفر

A baseless Ta'weel is like Kufr

In Ithaar ul Haq alal Khalq p.241, Wazir Yamani writes,

لان الكفر هو جحد الضروريات من الدين او تاويلها

This is because it is Kufr to reject the necessary aspects of Deen or to make Ta'weel in them.

Qadhi 'Iyaadh (RA)writes in Ash Shifa' known as Huqooq al Mustafa,

وكذلك يقطع بتكفير من كذب او انكر قاعدة من قواعد الشرعية وما عرف يقينا بالنقل المتواتر من فعل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ووقع الاجماع المتصل عليه كمن انكر وجوب الصلوات الخمس او عدد ركعاتها وسجداتها ويقول انما اوجب الله علينا في الكتاب الصلوة على الجملة وكونها خمسا وعلى هذا الصفات والشروط لا اعلمه اذ لم يرو في القرآن نص جلى . شفاء

Similarly, it will be said that a person is definitely a Kaafir who denies or belies any of the laws of Shari'ah or that action of Rasulullaah (SAW) that is proven through Tawaatur with conviction and consensus has been reached on it. For

example, a person denies the five Salaat or the number of rak'ats or sajdahs and he says that Allaah (SWT) has made Salaat compulsory on the whole in the Qur'aan. He does not accept it with the qualities and conditions because there is no clear text in the Qur'aan.
The following is mentioned in Sharh Shifa' Qadhi 'Iyaadh,

وكذلك العقد اجماعهم على ان مخالفة السمع الضرورى كفر وخروج عن الاسلام

Similarly, there is consensus on this that the one who denies a definite narration will be Kaafir and is out of Islaam.

Note:
From the clear statements of the Sahabah, Tabi'een and Imams of Deen it is clear that the law for not making Takfeer of a person who makes Ta'weel is not general.

In fact, the Ta'weel made against the necessary aspects of Deen is not Ta'weel, but it is Tahreef and Ilhaad. This is Kufr according to the consensus of the Ummah. If Ta'weel is generally understood to be sufficient to avoid Kufr, then even Shaytaan is not a Kaafir because he presents Ta'weel for his actions. 'You have created me from fire and You have created him from soil'. Similarly, those who worship idols cannot be Kaafir because their Ta'weel is mentioned in the Qur'aan itself. 'We do not worship them except that that they take us closer to Allaah'. **From this it becomes clear that which Ta'weel is against a clear text or consensus or against the necessary aspects of Deen, it is not Ta'weel but Tahreef and belying the Rasul (SAW). Another name for this is Ilhaad and Zandaqah.**

The ruling of classifying as Kaafir the people of Qiblah

Those who make Imaan and Islaam apparent are punctual on Salaat, fasting etc. and make baseless Ta'weel in clear definite commands and change its purport to something against the clear text of the Qur'aan, Sunnah and consensus of the Ummah- another question arises regarding classifying them (the above) as Kaafir and renegade. It is that these people are people of the Qiblah and Takfeer of the people of the Qiblah is prohibited according to the consensus of the Ummah.

Therefore it is necessary at this point to clarify who the people of the Qiblah are.
In essence, this chapter entails 2 Ahadith of Rasulullaah (SAW). One is narrated in Bukhari, Muslim etc. And deals with obedience to the leaders and is narrated by Hadhrat Anas (RA). Its words are,

من شهد ان لا اله الا الله واستقبل قبلتنا وصلى صلوتنا واكل ذبيحتنا فهو مسلم الا ان تروا كفرا بواحا عندكم من الله فيه برهان

He who testifies to 'there is no deity but Allaah' and faces our Qiblah and performs our Salaat and eats of our slaughtered animals is a Muslim but if you see clear Kufr and there is proof from Allaah.

The second narration is in Abu Dawood in Kitaab ul Jihaad. The text is,

عن انس قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاث من اصل الايمان الكف عمن قال لا اله الا الله ولا تكفره بذنب ولا تخرجه من الاسلام بعمل الحديث

Hadhrat Anas (RA) narrates that Rasulullaah (SAW) said that three things are real Imaan. Stopping from the one who says 'there is no deity but Allaah' and not to make Takfeer of him on the basis of some sin and not to take him out of Islaam on the basis of some action.

From these two, the first Hadith clarifies in the end that a person who says the Kalimah should not be called Kaafir until a clear statement or action of Kufr comes from him and an acceptable Ta'weel cannot be definitely proven from him.

It is clear from the words of the second Hadith that a person cannot be called a Kaafir on the basis of some sin or action, no matter how severe it is. However, according to the consensus of the Ummah, **sin at this place refers to other sins besides Kufr.** This means that wrong actions, sins and crimes, no matter how bad they are, a person of the Qiblah cannot be called a Kaafir on account of them. Not that he also makes apparent such beliefs that are against the definite articles of faith of Islaam and still too he is not called Kaafir.

Calling those who stopped from giving Zakaat and Musaylamah Kadh dhaab and his group as Kaafir and Murtad, the consensus of the Sahabah upon waging Jihaad against them is clear testimony that they were 'people of the Qiblah' – the Takfeer of whom is prohibited. The purport of it is not that the one who faces the Qiblah and performs Salaat cannot be called Kaafir on account of some baseless belief, **but we learn that the words Ahl e Qiblah is a technical term. The purport of this will be only those Muslims that are firm on the signs of Islaam, Salaat etc., and together with this they are pure from all those things that necessitate Kufr and baseless beliefs.**

This purport of the people of the Qiblah is clearly mentioned in the books of all the scholars of the Ummah. Hereunder a few views of the scholars of Islaam are presented, the objective of which is testimony of two things,

1. The correct purport of Ahl e Qiblah (people of the Qiblah)
2. The original subject of discussion that is testimony that it is Kufr and belying the Rasul to show some purport that is against the proven purport of the Qur'aan, Sunnah and Ijma' such belying is called Zandaqah and Ilhaad.

The research scholar Ibn Ameer al Haaj who is the student of Haafiz Ibn Hajar (RA) and Shaykh Ibn Humaam (RA). He writes in Tahreer ul Usul regarding the definition of the Ahl e Qiblah,

هو الموافق على ما هو من ضروريات الاسلام كحدوث العالم وحشر الاجساد من غير ان يصدر عنه شيئ من موجبات الكفر قطعا من اعتقاد راجع الى وجود اله غير الله تعالى او حلوله في بعض اشخاص الناس او انكار نبوة محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم او ذمه او استخفافه ونحو ذلك المخالف في اصول سواها (الى ان قال) وقد ظهر من هذا ان عدم تكفير اهل القبلة بذنب ليس على عمومه الا ان يحمل الذنب على ما ليس يكفر فيخرج الكفر به كما اشار اليه السبكى . شرح تحرير

Ahl e Qiblahh are those who are in accordance to all the necessary aspects of Islaam like the creation of the universe and the resurrection of the bodies. In such a way that nothing that necessitates Kufr comes from him, e.g. such a belief that leads one to believing another deity together with Allaah (SWT) and that Allaah can come into a person or rejecting the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah (SAW) or speaking ill of him or mocking him. Similarly, other matters…for this reason, it becomes clear that the Hadith prohibiting one from making Takfeer of the people of the Qiblah is not general. Yes, if the meaning of sin is taken to be other than Kufr as Allamah Subki (RA) has indicated then the general meaning could be taken.

In Sharh Maqaasid, regarding not making Takfeer of the people of the Qiblahh, it is written,

قال المبحث السابع في حكم مخالف الحق من اهل القبلة ليس بكافر ما لم يخالف ما هو من ضروريات الدين كحدوث العالم وحشر الاجساد

قال الشارح : ومعناه ان الذين اتفقوا على ما هو من ضروريات الاسلام كحدوث العالم وحشر الاجساد وما يشبه ذلك واختلفوا في اصول سواها كمسئلة الصفات وخلق الافعال وعموم الارادة وقدم الكلام وجواز الرؤية ونحو ذلك مما لا نزاع فيه ان الحق فيه واحد هل يكفر المخالف للحق بذلك الاعتقاد وبالقول به ام لا فلا نزاع في كفر اهل القبلة المواظب طول العمر على الطاعات باعتقاد قدم العالم ونفى الحشر ونفى العلم بالجزئيات ونحو ذلك وكذا الصدور شيئ من موجبات الكفر عنه . شرح مقاصد

The seventh discussion deals with the ruling of the one who is opposed to the truth and he is part of the people of the Qiblah, **he does not become a Kaafir as long as he does not oppose something that is part of the necessary aspects of Deen** like the creation of the world, resurrection and reckoning.

The commentator says, the meaning is that those who agree to the necessary aspects of Islaam like the creation of the world and reckoning and resurrection while in other principles they differ like in the matter of the qualities of Allaah and creation of actions and the general nature of the intention of Allaah and the possibility of seeing Allaah etc. There is no argument that the truth in these matters is one. So, will Takfeer be made of the one who has these beliefs and these views and opposes the truth?

There is no difference of opinion in the Takfeer of such people of the Qiblah that although they live their entire lives in obedience and together with this they are of the view that the world is eternal and they negate resurrection and negate the knowledge of Allaah in all small issues. **In this way, there is no**

difference of opinion in their Kufr because something that necessitates Kufr came from them.

The following is stated in Sharh Fiqh al Akbar of Mulla Ali al Qari (RA):

اعلم ان المراد باهل القبلة الذين اتفقوا على ما هو من ضروريات الدين كحدوث العالم وحشر الاجساد وعلم الله تعالى بالجزئيات وما اشبه ذلك من المسائل المهمات فمن واظب طول عمره على الطاعات والعبادات مع اعتقاد قدم العالم ونفى الحشر او نفى علمه سبحانه تعالى بالجزئيات لا يكون من اهل القبلة وان المراد باهل القبلة عند اهل السنة انه لا يكفر ما لم يوجد شيئ من امارات الكفر ولم يصدر عنه شيئ من موجباته . شرح فقه اكبر ١٨٩

It should be known that people of the Qiblah means those who agree upon the necessary aspects of Deen like the creation of the universe and resurrection and reckoning and the knowledge of Allaah about every small thing etc. so, the person who despite spending his entire life in obedience and worship, says that the world is eternal and rejects resurrection and reckoning and the knowledge of Allaah in every small thing, he is not part of the people of the Qiblah. The meaning of the people of the Qiblah according to the Ahl us Sunnah is that his Takfeer will not be made as long as none of the signs of Kufr are found in him and as long as none of the things that necessitate Kufr come from him. It is stated in Kashf ul Usool of Fakhr ul Islaam Bazdawi, Chapter on Ijma' vol.3 p.238, in Kitaab ul Ahkaam fi Usool al Ahkaam of Sayf ud Deen Aamidi and Ghaayatut Tahqeeq Sharh of Usool Husaami,

ان غلا فيه (اى في هؤلاء) حتى وجب الكفارة به لا يعتبر خلافه ووفاقه ايضا لعدم دخوله في مسمى الامة المشهود لها بالعصمة وان صلى الى القبلة واعتقد نفسه مسلما لان الامة ليست عبادة عن المصلين الى القبلة بل عن المؤمنين وهو كافر وان كان لا يدرى انه كافر . عاية التحقيق

If a person exaggerates in fulfilling his desires until Takfeer of him becomes compulsory, his opposition will not be considered even though he faces the Qiblah and performs Salaat and understands himself to be a Muslim. This is because 'Ummah' does not refer to those who face the Qiblah and perform Salaah, but Mu'minoon refers to them. He is a Kaafir even though he does not have knowledge of his becoming a Kaafir.

In Radd ul Muhtaar, Allamah Shaami (RA) writes with reference from Sharh Tahreer ul Usool of Ibn Humaam (RA):

لا خلاف في كفر المخالف في ضروريات الاسلام وان كان من اهل القبلة المواظب طول عمره على الطاعات كما في شرح التحرير . شامى ٢٧٧ /١

The one who is opposed to the necessary aspects of Islaam, there is no difference of opinion regarding his Kufr even though he is of those who face the Qiblah and remains obedient throughout his life.

In Bahr ur Raa'iq Sharh Kanz ud Daqaa'iq the following is mentioned,

والحاصل ان المذهب عدم تكفير احد من المخالفين فيما ليس من الاصول المعلومة من الدين ضرورة . بحر

The summary is that the Madh hab states that none of the opposition should be made Takfeer of, on who denies something other than the principles of Deen.

The following is written in Nibraas Sharh of Sharh Aqaa'id Nasafi,

اهل القبلة في اصطلاح المتكلمين من يصدق بضروربات الدين اى الامور التى علم ثبوتها في الشرع واشتهر فمن انكر شيئا من الضروريات كحدوث العالم وحشر الاجساد وعلم الله سبحانه بالجزئيات وفرضية الصلوة والصوم لم يكن من اهل القبلة ولو كان مجاهد بالطاعات وكذالك من باشر شيئا من امارات التكذيب كسجود الصنم والاهانة بامر شرعى والاستهزاء عليه فليس من اهل القبلة ومعنى عدم تكفير اهل القبلة ان لا يكفر بارتكاب المعاصى ولا بانكار الامور الحنفية غير المشهورة . نبراس ٥٧٣

The people of the Qiblah according to the Mutakallimeen are those who verify all the necessary aspects of Deen, i.e. those things that are famous and proven and known in the Shari'ah. So, whoever denies any of the necessary aspects of Deen like the creation of the world, resurrection and the knowledge of Allaah about small things and the obligation of Salaat and Fasting, he will not be of the people of the Qiblah even though he is obedient. **Similarly, the person will not be part of the people of the Qiblah who does such an action that is a sign of clear belying like prostrating before an idol or doing something that will entail mocking or belittling a command of the Shari'ah.** The meaning of not making Takfeer of the people of the Qiblah is that Takfeer will not be made by them committing sins and crimes or by them denying hidden matters that are not famous, Takfeer of them will not be made.

The following is stated in the famous and well known work, Mawaaqif,

لا يكفر اهل القبلة الا فيما فيه انكار ما علم مجيئه به بالضرورة او اجمع عليه كاستحلال المحرمات

Takfeer of the people of the Qiblah will not be made but in the case where they deny the necessary aspects of Deen or **such a thing is denied upon which consensus has been reached like making Haraam things Halaal.**

Sharh Fiqh al Akbar states,

ولا يخفى ان المراد بقول علمائنا لا يجوز تكفير اهل القبلة بذنب ليس مجرد التوجه الى القبلة فان الغلاة من الروافض الذين يدعون ان جبرئيل غلط في الوحى فان الله تعالى ارسله الى على رضى الله عنه وبعضهم قالوا انه اله وان صلوا الى القبلة ليسوا بمؤمنين وهذا هو المراد بقوله صلى الله عليه وسلم من صلى صلوتنا واكل ذبيحتنا فذلك مسلم . شرح فقه اكبر

It is not hidden that the meaning of the statement of our scholars that 'Takfeer of the people of Qiblah on the basis of some sin is not permissible' does not only refer to facing the Qiblah because some extreme Rawaafidh are such that they claim that Jibreel (AS) made a mistake in bringing revelation because Allaah (SWT) sent him to Hadhrat Ali (RA). Some Rawaafidh say that Hadhrat Ali (RA) is a deity. Although these people face the Qiblah and perform Salaah, they are not believers. This is the meaning of the statement of Rasulullaah (SAW) that he who performs our Salaah and eats of our slaughtered animals is a Muslim.

The following is stated in Kulliyaat Abul Baqaa',

فلا نكفر اهل القبلة ما لم يأت بما يوجب الكفر وهذا من قبيل قوله تعالى ان الله يغفر الذنوب جميعا مع ان الكفر غير مغفور ومختار جمهور اهل السنة من الفقهاء والمتكلمين عدم اكفار اهل القبلة من المبتدعة الماؤلة في غير الضرورية لكون التاويل شبهة كما في خزانة الجرجانى والمحيط البرهانى واحكام الرازى واصول البزدوى ورواه الكرخى والحاكم الشهيد عن الامام ابى حنيفة والجرجانى عن

الحسن بن زياد وشارح المواقف والمقاصد والامدى عن الشافعى والاشعرى لا مطلقا . ٥٥٤

We will not make Takfeer of the people of Qiblah as long as something that does not necessitate Kufr comes from them. This is as Allaah (SWT) says that 'Allaah forgives all sins' despite Kufr being unpardonable. From the stance of the majority of the juro-consultants and Mutakallimeen of the Ahl us Sunnah, **the innovators who make Ta'weel in the parts of Deen that are not counted as necessary. Regarding them, Takfeer will not be made** as is mentioned in Khazaana of Jurjaani and Muheet al Burhaani and Ahkaam of Raazi and Usul e Bazdawi. Haakim Shahid and Karkhi have narrated this from Imam Abu Hanifah (RA) and Jurjaani from Hasan bin Ziyaad and from the commentator of Mawaaqif and Maqaasid and Aamidi from Shafi'i and from Ash'ari.

The following is stated in Fath ul Mugheeth Sharh Alfiyyah al Hadith,

اذ لا نكفر احد من اهل القبلة الا بانكار قطعى من الشريعة . ١٤٣

We will not make Takfeer of anyone of the Qiblah except on account of rejecting a clear definite order of the Shari'ah

Imam Rabbaani Mujaddid Alf e Thani (RA) writes in his letters,
Due to the fact that this group of innovators are of the people of the Qiblah, therefore one should not be bold in making Takfeer of them until they reject the necessary aspects of Deen and they do not reject the Mutawaatir laws of the Shari'ah and do not accept the necessary aspects of Deen.

The following is stated in Aqa'id Adudiyyah,

لا نكفر احد من اهل القبلة الا بما فيه نفى الصانع المختار او بما فيه شرك او انكار النبوة وانكار ما علم من الدين بالضرورة او انكار مجمع عليه واما غير ذلك فالقائل مبتدع وليس بكافر

We will not make Takfeer of anyone of the people of the Qiblah but in the case where they reject the existence of Allaah (SWT) or in the case of polytheism or in the case of rejection of nubuwwah or rejection of the necessary aspects of Deen or **rejection of such a matter upon which consensus has been reached.** The person holding other views will be an innovator, not a Kaafir.

Great caution regarding classifying a claimant of Islaam as Kaafir

From the discussion above it is learnt that every person who faces the Qiblah is not part of the people of the Qiblah. This is a technical term of the Shari'ah that is said with regard to those who perform Salaah facing our Qiblah and they do not reject any of the necessary aspects of Deen or interpolate it. Due to this (rejection or interpolation) a person will have to be called a Kaafir even if he calls himself a Muslim and performs Salaah and fasts, he can make Tilaawat and serve the Deen. However, if he rejects the clear and necessary aspects or command of Deen then he will be classified Kafir.

However, at this point, there is danger of another form of negligence that the doors of Muslims making Takfeer of each other will open and that is a path of their destruction. In one era, this danger was only a danger, but it was a reality that some so called scholars who were ignorant of the reality of Deen made it a profession that upon the smallest of things they began to also call Muslims Kaafir. Fatwas of Kufr passed between them and they were also deceived by the rulings in

the books of Fiqh that are discussed under the chapter of 'words of Kufr' that certain words or statements are words of Kufr. The consequence of this was that the words spoken and some necessary aspects of Deen were rejected and not classified as words of Kufr.

However, together with this, the juro-consultants have also clarified that these words being words of Kufr do not ever mean that a person who says these words without thinking and understanding and without research regarding the meaning, the person is called Kaafir until it is not proven that the meaning and purport of the statement entails a belief of Kufr or rejection of some necessary aspect of deen.

However, those who are unaware of the reality have made these words the basis of Kufr and have begun to make Takfeer of each other. One great harm of this is that calling a Muslim a Kaafir is a great matter. This affects the entire Muslim society. Besides this, there is danger of one's Imaan – which has been explained before. On the other hand, by this Takfeer of each other, this great harm comes about that the Fatwa of Kufr has become something trivial. The person who claims Islaam and in reality is Kaafir gets the chance that these people call each other Kaafir, we are also subject to this Takfeer.

Therefore, it was necessary that at this place it is also clarified that calling Kaafir someone who calls himself a Muslim in this great caution is necessary. By calling a person Kaafir upon something trivial or by giving fatwa of Kufr on the basis of some statement that has various possibilities or is vague, without research there is danger of one's own Imaan. Regarding this carelessness, the detailed article of Imam Ghazaali (RA)has passed. For further clarification and emphasis, the following lines are also written.

Classifying a Muslim as Kaafir is Kufr itself

Rasulullaah (SAW) is reported to have said in an authentic Hadith,

عن ابی سعید الخدری رضی الله عنه قال قال رسول الله علیه وسلم ما اکفر رجل رجلا الا باء احدهما به ان کان کافرا والا کفر بتکفیره وفي رواية فقد وجب الکفر علی احدهما . ترغیب وترهیب المندر واکفار ٥٠

Hadhrat Abu Sa'eed Khudri (RA) narrates that Rasulullaah (SAW) said, "A person does not make Takfeer of another except that one of them becomes worthy of Kufr because if the person was a Kaafir in reality then he was a Kaafir, otherwise this person making Takfeer will become a Kaafir." One narration states that Kufr becomes compulsory for one of them.

A doubt and its reply

The summary is that the person called a Kaafir, if he is not a Kaafir in reality then the person who calls him a Kaafir will become Kaafir. However, the definition of Kufr in the light of the clear text of the Qur'aan that has passed above apparently does not refer to the one who called another person a Kaafir without a Shar'i reason incorrectly. This is because such a person did not belie Allaah or His Rasul. Therefore, some juro-consultants have taken this to refer to warning and caution, like the words 'indeed he has made Kufr' is used for warning and Kufr in reality is not meant.

In Mukhtasar Mushkil al Aathaar *(from Ikfaar ul Mulhideen p.50)* and Ithaar ul Haq alal Khalq p.432 of Imam Ghazaali (RA)the meaning of this has been mentioned that the meaning

of calling a person Kaafir at this point is that his beliefs and thoughts are Kufr. So, if in reality nothing in his beliefs entail Kufr, but all his beliefs entail Imaan then it is as though he has referred to Imaan as Kufr and undoubtedly calling Imaan Kufr entails belying Allaah and His Rasul. The Qur'aan states,

ومن يكفر بالايمان فقد حبط عمله

He who rejects Imaan, his actions have been destroyed

The summary of this is that the person who does not have Kufr in his beliefs, no matter how bad his actions might be, it is not permissible to call him a Kaafir. In fact, the person calling the other Kaafir – his own Imaan will be in danger because the summary of his calling Kaafir is that it is as though he is calling Imaan Kufr. From this it has become clear that the beliefs of the person in which there is Kufr, and someone called him a Kaafir then the person calling him Kaafir does not become Kaafir by consensus.

This is because he has not called Imaan Kufr even though the juro-consultants and the research scholars have sternly prohibited calling a person Kaafir in these conditions as well. **As long as some permissible interpretation can be made regarding the words of Kufr of his Kufr belief it will not be permissible to call him Kaafir.** If we hear the beliefs of a person or words of Kufr and called him Kaafir hurriedly, then the person calling the other Kaafir will not become a Kaafir according to the consensus of the scholars.

Similarly, if a person has some wrong news about a person or misunderstanding or he is in deception about the beliefs of another person, e.g. he thinks that a person belittled a Nabi (May Allaah protect us), or he spoke ill regarding Allaah, then in such a case it would have been necessary for him to

research that thought and come to know the reality and refrain from having ill thoughts. However, out of carelessness, based only on his thoughts he called the other person Kaafir. In this case also, because the person did not call Imaan Kufr therefore, the person calling him will not be a Kaafir. It is another matter altogether that he is sinful for his carelessness.

The juro-consultants have went to the level of giving the command of cautiousness that if some confusing speech is uttered by a person in which there is a hundred possibilities and ninety nine have a possibility of a subject of Kufr and only one possibility of Kufr is in the text that could become a correct and permissible meaning, then it is necessary upon the Mufti that he leaves the ninety nine and inclines towards the one and he should stay away from calling the person a Kaafir. **This is on condition that he does not state something clearly or do something openly that implies a meaning that could only be taken to be Kufr. This subject has been explained in Fataawa Aalamgiri,**

اذا كان في المسئلة وجوه توجب الكفر ووجه واحد يمنع فعلى المفتى ان يميل الى ذلك الوجه الا اذا صرح بارادة ما يوجب الكفر فلا ينفعه التاويل حينئذ

When there are a number of possibilities in a matter that necessitate Kufr and one possibility prevents it, then it is the responsibility of the Mufti that he should go to the one possibility. **However, when the speaker clearly states something that necessitates Kufr, then there will be no benefit of any Ta'weel at that time.**

Note:

It should be known that the meaning of this statement of the juro-consultants is not what a few ignorant people understand that if there is a belief or statement of a person that entails Imaan then take him to be a believer because this is its meaning. In this case, there will be no Kaafir in the world, even Iblees will not be a Kaafir because the some belief or the other of every disbeliever will be in accordance to Imaan. The objective of the juro-consultants is that the speech that comes from a person, if it has the possibility of different meanings in terms of lexicography and common usage and one meaning will take a person out of having a Kufr belief and all the other meanings are classified as Kufr, then in such a case it will be necessary upon the Mufti to take his speech to refer to the correct meaning and refer to him as a believer on condition that he does not clearly state something whose meaning is Kufr.

In summary, the above Hadith stating that the one who calls another person Kaafir incorrectly will be classified Kaafir, whether it be for warning or putting fear in him like some juro-consultants have understood (Al Yawaaqeet of Sha'raani), or it means Kufr in reality, in every case the consequence of the Hadith definitely comes out that it is necessary for one to adopt great caution in calling one who claims Islaam to be a Kaafir.

Based on this, the research scholars and juro-consultants state that it is not permissible to call a Muslim Kaafir based on such words and beliefs about which there is difference of opinion regarding it being Kufr or in the case where a permissible interpretation can be made.

A second angle of caution

Just as it is great carelessness and throwing one's Imaan in danger to call a person Kaafir on the basis of subsidiary difference of opinion or on the basis of some statement that has various possibilities or it is vague, or by the person having some belief or saying something about which there is difference of opinion among the scholars about it being Kufr because in this case it necessitates that Imaan is referred to as Kufr. **In exactly the same way, to refer to a Kaafir as a Muslim is also a dangerous crime and throwing one's Imaan into danger because in this case Kufr is referred to as Imaan.** It is quite apparent that if a person out of his own choice refers to Imaan as Kufr or vice versa, then undoubtedly it is Kufr, or it is not free of being in danger of Kufr.

In addition, calling a Kaafir to be Muslim is not just some generosity with words, it is great oppression on the entire religion and the Muslim community. This is because the entire society is affected. It will affect Nikaah, lineage, inheritance, slaughtered animals, Imamat in Salaat and the collective and political rights.

This is because the form of Kufr that has been explained above, in the terminology of the Shari'ah it is referred to as Zandaqah and Ilhaad, this is where a person believes in Allaah and His Rasul in his heart and attests to this with his tongue and he is punctual upon Salaat, fasting, Hajj, Zakaat and the other signs of Islaam, but together with this he has some Kufr beliefs. **Alternatively, he interpolates the laws of Deen by making some baseless Ta'weel in the necessary aspects of Deen.** This matter is very dangerous if it is taken up. Through just a little carelessness, a true Muslim could be taken out of the fold of Islaam and a Kaafir enemy of Islaam could be brought into the brotherhood of Muslims. Both these dangers

are great for the religion and the consequences of it are severe as well.

Necessary points

(Adapted from the booklet Wusool ul Ifkaar)

Due to the extremities in today’s time and the carelessness regarding the matter of Kufr and Islaam, 30 years ago, in 1351, we wrote a reply to a question that was very detailed. It was titled Wusool al Afkaar ila Usul al Ikfaar. Is was also published. We feel it appropriate to present a summary of it here.

The reality is that it is a very grave matter to call a Muslim Kaafir or to call a Kaafir a Muslim. The Noble Qur’aan has cautioned in severe terms regarding both. The Noble Qur’aan states regarding calling a Muslim Kaafir,

يٰٓاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْٓا اِذَا ضَرَبْتُمْ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ فَتَبَيَّنُوْا وَلَا تَقُوْلُوْا لِمَنْ اَلْقٰٓى اِلَيْكُمُ
السَّلٰمَ لَسْتَ مُؤْمِنًا ۚ تَبْتَغُوْنَ عَرَضَ الْحَيٰوةِ الدُّنْيَا ۫ فَعِنْدَ اللّٰهِ مَغَانِمُ كَثِيْرَةٌ ؕ
كَذٰلِكَ كُنْتُمْ مِّنْ قَبْلُ فَمَنَّ اللّٰهُ عَلَيْكُمْ فَتَبَيَّنُوْا ؕ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ كَانَ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ خَبِيْرًا

> O you who have Imaan! When you travel in Allaah’s way, then verify and do not say to the one who makes his submission apparent, “You are not a Mu’min!” seeking the gains of this worldly life. With Allaah lies tremendous booty. You were the same before, until Allaah bestowed His favour on you. So verify! Indeed Allaah is informed of what you do. *[Surah Nisaa 4:94]*

From this verse we learn that whoever makes his Islaam apparent, so until complete research is not done regarding his Kufr, it will be impermissible to call him a Kaafir, if one does, it will be a great calamity.

Similarly, the opposite, i.e. calling a Kaafir a Muslim. Its prohibition is mentioned in the following verse,

اَتُرِيْدُوْنَ اَنْ تَهْدُوْا مَنْ اَضَلَّ اللهُ ؕ وَمَنْ يُّضْلِلِ اللهُ فَلَنْ تَجِدَ لَهٗ سَبِيْلًا

> Do you wish to guide him whom Allaah has sent astray? You shall never find a road for the one whom Allaah has sent astray. *[Surah Nisaa 4:88]*

Tafseer Jalalayn says that 'to guide him' means that to count the Kuffaar from among the guided.

The pious predecessors, the Sahabah and ta'bieen and those who came after them have advised us to adopt great caution in this matter. The juro-consultants and the Mutakallimeen have taken this matter to be very important and difficult. They advised those who adopted this path to be wary and aware.

Subsequently, Allamah Qaari (RA) has quoted Imam ul Haramayn in Sharh Shifa, Chapter called 'Tahqeeq al Qawl fi Ikfaar al Muta'awileen',

ادخال كافر في الملة الاسلامية او اخراج مسلم عنها عظيم في الدين . شرح شفاء ٢ /٥٠٠

To understand a Kaafir to be part of Islaam or to take out a Muslim from Islaam are both severe things.

However, today, the opposite is happening that such ease is found in these matters that there has remained no standard or principles regarding Kufr, Islaam and Imaan and Irtidaad.

One group has made it their hobby to make Takfeer of others. Upon the slightest deed against the Shari'ah, in fact, something against their nature happens, and they pass fatwa

of Kufr on those people. They remove people from the fold of Islaam for the smallest of things. On the other side, another group according to whom Imaan and Islaam has no reality, they call every person a Muslim that claims to be a Muslim no matter if he rejects the Qur'aan and Hadith and the laws of Islaam and belittles them. According to their understanding of Islaam, every type of Kufr will be included in Islaam.

Like Hinduism and other religions, they have made Islaam the title of a nation that a person can have whatever type of beliefs he wants, he is free to do and say what he wants, in every case he is a Muslim. He terms this broad thinking and broadmindedness.

However, Islaam and the messenger of Islaam, Rasulullaah (SAW) are free from both extremes. Islaam has presented a divine law for its followers. The person who accepts it with an open heart and does not feel any straitened feeling in his heart is a Muslim. **The one who rejects any clear ruling of this divine law is definitely and undoubtedly out of the fold of Islaam.** Islaam is free from keeping him within its fold and through this the Muslims will have self honour regarding counting that person amongst them. There is a great danger of taking thousands of Muslims out of the fold of Islaam by taking such people to be out off the fold of Islaam as is experienced and witnessed.

Question One

What is the standard of Kufr and Islaam? Upon what basis can a person be called Murtad and be taken out of the fold of Islaam?

Answer

The meaning of irtidaad in the dictionary is to turn or return. According to the technical definition of the Shari’ah, turning away from Imaan and Islaam is called Irtidaad and the one turning away is called a Murtad.
There are two forms of Irtidaad.

One is that if a wretched person changes the religion and turns away from Islaam like the Christians, Jews, Aryans etc. They choose a religion or reject the oneness of Allaah or they reject the Risaalat of Rasulullaah (SAW).

The second form is that they do not clearly change the religion or reject Tauheed and Risaalat but they adopt such actions, statements or beliefs that entail a meaning of rejection of the Qur’aan or rejection of Risaalat. **For example, they reject a clear definite necessary aspect of Islaam that is clearly proven from the text of the Qur’aan or it is proven through Tawaatur from Rasulullaah (SAW).** This form is also included in irtidaad according to the consensus of the Ummah even though he is punctual upon all the laws of Islaam besides it.

The definition of Imaan is famous and well known. It has two parts. One is to believe in Allaah (SWT) and the second is to believe in Rasulullaah (SAW). However, bringing Imaan in Allaah (SWT) does not mean that a person only accepts the existence of Allaah, **but it is necessary to believe in all His complete qualities of knowledge, hearing, seeing, power etc. as befits His honour that is mentioned in the Qur’aan and Hadith.** Otherwise, every religion accepts the existence of Allaah, the Jews, Christians, Magians all agree to this.

Similarly, the meaning of bringing Imaan in Rasulullaah (SAW) is not that you accept his existence that he was born in

Makkah Muazzamah and he migrated to Madinah Tayyibah. In 63 years he did this and that, but the reality of bringing Imaan in Rasulullaah (SAW) is that which is explained in the following words of the Qur'aan,

فَلَا وَرَبِّکَ لَا یُؤْمِنُوْنَ حَتّٰی یُحَکِّمُوْکَ فِیْمَا شَجَرَ بَیْنَہُمْ ثُمَّ لَا یَجِدُوْا فِیْٓ
اَنْفُسِہِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَیْتَ وَیُسَلِّمُوْا تَسْلِیْمًا

Never! By the oath of your Rabb, they cannot have Imaan until they make you judge their disputes and they do not find any dissatisfaction in that which you decide and they accept with complete submission. *[Surah Nisaa 4:65]*

In Ruh al Ma'ani, the Tafseer of this verse has been narrated from the pious predecessors as follows:

فقد روى عن الصادق رضى الله عنه انه قال لو ان قوما عبدو الله تعالى واقاموا
الصلوة وآتوا الزكوة وصاموا رمضان وحجوا البيت ثم قالوا الشيئ صنعه رسول
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الا صنع خلاف ما صنع او وجدوا في انفسهم لكانوا
مشركين ثم تلا هذه الاية . ٦٥/٦

It is narrated from Hadhrat Ja'far As Sadiq (RA) that if a nation worships Allaah and is punctual upon Salaah and gives Zakaat and keeps the fast of Ramadhaan and makes Hajj of the Baytullaah but he says regarding an action that is proven from Rasulullaah (SAW) that why did he do it, why did he not do the opposite of it and by him accepting he feels his heart straitened, then this nation is from the polytheists.

From the verse mentioned above and its Tafseer it becomes clear that the reality of bringing Imaan in Risaalat is that all the laws brought by the Rasul should be accepted with an open heart and a person should not display any form of displeasure or reservations about them.

Once the reality of Imaan is known then the form of Kufr and Irtidaad has also been clarified. This is because Imaan is to accept and submit and belying and rejecting them is Kufr and Irtidaad. (Sharh al Maqaasid). It has also been proven from the above mentioned definition of Imaan and Kufr that Kufr is not only that a person does not believe in Allaah and His Rasul (SAW), but this is also a stage of Kufr and a branch of disbelief that the laws that are clearly and definitely proven from Rasulullaah (SAW) is accepted (understanding that it is a ruling from Rasulullaah (SAW)) and it is rejected, even though he accepts all other rulings and he practices upon all of them with due importance.

Note:

At this point, two things are worthy of consideration. The first is that Kufr and Irtidaad will be in the case when a person rejects accepting a clear ruling and turns away and he does not have the belief that it is compulsory to practice upon it. However, if a person does understand the ruling to be compulsory to practice, but he does not practice out of evil habit or bad habit, then it will not be called Kufr and Irtidaad even though the opportunity to practice on that ruling does not arise throughout his life.

Anyway, the person will be understood to be a Muslim. In the first case a person did not know that it is compulsory to practice upon a clear ruling even though he practiced upon it throughout his life he will be called a Kaafir and Murtad. For example, a person is punctual upon the five times daily Salaat but he does not know that it is obligatory to practice upon it,

he is a Kaafir. Another person knows that it is obligatory but he does not perform it. He will be a great sinner.

The second thing which has to be thought about is that in terms of proof, the laws of Islaam are of different types. Regarding this matter, all the types do not carry the same ruling. Kufr and Irtidaad will only come about in the case where such laws are rejected that are clearly and definitely proven and they prove something clear and definite. This means that it is proven from the Qur'aan or such Ahadith that have been narrated by so many narrators from the blessed era of Rasulullaah (SAW) until today by different classes and in different cities that it is considered impossible for all of them to agree upon lies. (This is called Tawaatur in the terminology of the Shari'ah and such Ahadith are called Ahadith Mutawaatira)

Clear in what it shows means that the text of the Qur'aan dealing with it or is proven from a Mutawaatir Hadith, it clarifies its purport. There is no type of confusion or vagueness in which some Ta'weel could be resorted to.

Then, if this type of ruling becomes famous and well known in every class of the Muslims, special and general that attaining them does not depend on any special learning and teaching, but generally the Muslims know of it coming down the generations like Salaah, fasting, Hajj, Zakaat etc. being obligatory and stealing, drinking being sins, Rasulullaah (SAW) being the final Nabi etc., then such laws are referred to as the necessary aspects of Deen. Those that are not of this status will only be definite and clear not the necessary aspects.

The difference in ruling between the necessary aspects and clear rulings is that rejection of the necessary aspects is Kufr

by consensus of the Ummah. **Ignorance is not an excuse and no Ta'weel will be considered.**

Regarding the clear rulings that have not reached the level of fame, then according to the Hanafiyyah there is detail that if a general person rejects out of ignorance, then the ruling of Kufr and Irtidaad will not be given, but he will be taught that this ruling is part of the definite clear rulings of Islaam and it is Kufr to reject it. After this, if he remains on his rejection, then the ruling of Kufr will be given.

كما في المسائرة والمسامرة لان الهمام رحمه الله ولفظه واما ما ثبت قطعا ولم ابلغ حد الضرورة كاستحقاق بنت الابن السدس مع البنت الصلبية باجماع المسلمين فظاهر كلام الحنفية الاكفار بجحده بانهم لم يشتر طوافى الاكفار سوى القطع في الثبوت (الى قوله) ويجب حمله على ما اذا علم المنكر ثبوته قطعا . مسامرة ١٤٩

Regarding the ruling that is clearly proven but it has not reached the stage of the necessary aspects like (in inheritance) of a granddaughter and real daughter are together, then the granddaughter getting a sixth is proven from the consensus of the Ummah. So, the apparent speech of the Hanafiyyah is that on the basis of rejection, the ruling of Kufr will be given because besides the condition of being proven clearly, there is no other condition…but it is compulsory that the speech of the Hanafiyyah should be taken to be that when the rejecter has knowledge that this ruling is clearly proven.

The summary is that just as Kufr and Irtidaad is a type of changing the religion, similarly, another type is that if the necessary aspects of Deen or the clear rulings are rejected or such an interpretation is made in the necessary aspects of Deen though which a meaning that is against the known meaning is created and the known purport is changed.

The principle of Takfeer

Therefore the principle of the Shari'ah regarding Takfeer of a Muslim is that as long as there is scope for a correct meaning to be taken from the speech of a person and there is nothing against it clearly mentioned by the speaker or there is the smallest difference of opinion among the Imams regarding it being Kufr, until that time the person will not be called a Kaafir. However, if a person denies a necessary aspect of Deen or he makes such an interpretation or change that creates a meaning that is against the known one, then no thought should be given to whether this person is Kaafir or not. And Allaah knows best.

The addendum of the ruling of Imdaad ul Fataawa vol.6

All that has been explained is in the case when it is definitely proven from a person or group that he or they have some Kufr belief or uttered some Kufr statements. However, if a person himself has doubt whether this person has this belief or whether he says a particular statement, then the cautious way is that which is mentioned in Imdaad ul Fataawa which is presented here verbatim as a conclusion.

If there are reservations about the ruling of Kufr regarding a person or group, whether the causes of the doubt is the differences of the scholars or a conflict of reason or confusion of the principles, then the safest way is that the ruling of Kufr is not given, nor the ruling of Islaam should be given. In the first ruling, there is carelessness regarding his own knowledge and in the second ruling there is carelessness regarding the matters of other Muslims. So, in the rulings, both types of caution should be adopted, i.e. he will not be given permission

to marry nor will he be followed nor will his slaughtered animal be eaten nor will the Kaafir government be given control over him.

If he has the ability to do research, the person's beliefs should be checked and the ruling will be passed according to the findings. If he does not have the ability to research, then silence should be adopted and his matter should be handed over to Allaah. The example of this is the ruling of the doubtful narrations of the people of the book mentioned in the Hadith.

لا تصدقوا اهل الكتاب ولا تكذبواهم وقولوا آمنا بالله وما انزل الينا الآية رواه البخارى

Do not belie and do not verify the people of the book. Say we believe in Allaah and the revelation that has come down upon us.

The second example is from the Fiqh ruling regarding a hermaphrodite,

يوخذ فيه بالاحوط والاوثق في امور الدين وان لا يحكم بثبوت حكم وقع الشك في ثبوته واذا وقف خلف الامام قام بين صف الرجال والنساء ويصلى بقناع ويجلس في صلاته جلوس المرأة ويكره له في حياته لبس الحلى والحرير وان يخلوا به غير محرم من رجل او امرأة او يسافر مع غير محرم من الرجال والاناث ولا يغسله رجل ولا امرأة وتيمم بالصعيد ويكفن كما يكفن الجارية وامثاله مما فصله الفقهاء . شعبان ١٣٥١ه

Regarding the hermaphrodite, the form that has caution will be taken and no ruling will be given regarding something about which there is doubt about the proof. When he stands in Salaat, he will stand in the row between the men and women, he will wear a head covering like the women, he will

sit in Qa'dah like women. It is undesirable for him to wear jewellery and silk. It is also undesirable that a man or woman (non Mahram) sits in solitude with him or he travels with a man or woman that is not his Mahram. After he dies, no man will bath him, or any woman. Tayammum will be performed and the shroud will be like the one given to girls. Similar is the case with the other rulings that the juro-consultants have written in detail about.

Summary of the booklet together with answers to some objections

In this matter, **the first thing that needs to be considered is that coming out of the fold of Islaam or in order to be Kaafir intention or resolve is not necessary.** The greatest devil, Iblees, did not make an intention to become Kaafir but his action made him a Kaafir. Regarding this the Qur'aan says, 'He was of the disbelievers.' In the first century (of Islaam) those who refused to give Zakaat and the followers of Musailamah the liar did not leave the religion of Islaam, but by the consensus of the Sahabah they were removed from the fold of Islaam. The reason is that if together with Ta'weel, rejection is done – if this is taken out from general belying and rejection, then the greatest disbeliever will also not be taken out of the fold of Islaam. In fact, one will have to call the idol worshippers, Jews and Christians Muslims then.

This is because Shaytaan never rejected Allaah being a deity or His qualities, but he only rejected prostrating to someone other than Allaah. He can say that I am the greatest person in terms of believing in the oneness of Allaah, but Allaah gave this stubbornness the ruling of belying and classified it as the greatest Kufr. Similarly, the general idol worshippers make this Ta'weel at times that we do not take the idols as deities

but we do it thinking them to take us closer to Allaah and for His pleasure we worship them. The Qur'aan itself mentions this Ta'weel of the idol worshippers and classifies it as not worthy of attention, 'We only worship the idols so that they may take us closer to Allaah'. Sometimes they make this Ta'weel that these idols are not Allaah directly but they are the ownership of Allaah. However, on account of great closeness they also have knowledge and power etc and are partner to Allaah. It is narrated in a Hadith that the polytheists used to say the following as Talbiyah when they went for Hajj,

'There is no partner for you, except that which is in Your ownership, i.e. the idols etc.'

In summary, the polytheists and idol worshippers never used to go against the Kalimah 'There is no deity but Allaah', but they adopted the path of Ta'weel. However, the Qur'aan and Hadith classified such baseless Ta'weel and belying and rejection and called all of them Kaafir. This is because the clear text of the Qur'aan and Hadith does not carry the purport of making someone an exception. In addition, the general nature of 'There is no deity but Allaah', in its general apparent meaning is the belief of the Muslim Ummah without any exception,

Similarly, the person who makes some exception and special case regarding the verse of the final Nabi and the Hadith 'there is no Nabi after me' and says that he is the final Nabi and no Nabi will come after him except the one who comes as Zilli or Buruzi, that the person is Rasulullaah (SAW) himself or his shadow, then in reality it is a form of the Ta'weel of the Arabs that they used to say in their Talbiyah.

If those who make baseless Ta'weel in the finality of the prophet-hood and in the Hadith 'There is no Nabi after me' are not understood to be out of the fold of Islaam, then the idol worshippers, in fact their teacher and leader Iblees will not be out of the fold of Islaam and he will not be Kaafir. Those who rebuke others regarding those who make these baseless interpretations and belie the beliefs of the Ummah and the clear texts of the Qur'aan and Hadith and say that the Muslims are harmed and their numbers are getting less or they are dividing the Ummah, then they should think that if the meaning of saving ourselves from division and differences means this that a person can do and say as he likes but he will not be taken to be out of the fold of Islaam then what support will the Ummah get from the Zindeeqs and Mulhids? In the light of such baseless interpretations, all the disbelievers of the world can be included in the Muslim Ummah. If a person wants to adopt such actions, then he can do it to his satisfaction so that all the nations in the world and governments can become his and the war between Imaan and Kufr will end.

However, it is apparent that by this enlightened thinking and ways, a person will wash his hands off the Qur'aan. 'Some of you are disbelievers and some of you are believers' has been announced. It has established the group of Allaah and the group of Shaytaan. Half of it, i.e. the Qur'aan is filled with opposition and Jihaad against Kufr and the Kuffaar.

This does not make Kaafir, it shows Kaafir

Today, many people who are not aware of the principles of Deen are affected by the apparent Salaah and fasting of the Mulhideen and accuse the scholars who call them Kaafir, that they are making Muslims Kaafir. It has become clear from the

quoted proofs that they do not show anyone to be Kaafir. However, he who is a Kaafir based on his own beliefs, a Muslim will be able to show him being a Kaafir.

The summary is that this form of belying the Rasul is called Zandaqah and Ilhaad is the worst form of belying and Kufr. It is more dangerous than Kufr to Islaam and the Muslims. A Kaafir like Iblees was made Kaafir on account of this type of Kufr.

However, because this belying was not in the clear colours of belying, therefore most Muslims were deceived about it, especially when the person doing it is punctual upon the signs of Islaam like Salaat, fasting, Tilaawat etc.

Therefore there was a need to clarify the reality in the light of the clear texts of the Qur'aan, Hadith and statements of the senior scholars of the Ummah. So, all praise is due to Allaah, complete details of this have been mentioned in this booklet that to take some other purport by making Ta'weel against the purport of the clear definite laws of Islaam upon which consensus has been reached, i.e. consensus upon the purport. This is in reality belying the Rasul.

In this discussion, it is also learnt that the prohibition of making Takfeer of the people of the Qiblah in the Hadith, the purport of this is not that whoever faces the Qiblah is a Muslim. It is a technical term in the Shari'ah. It refers to those who perform the general signs of Islaam like Salaat, fasting etc. and no action or speech comes from them through which Rasulullaah (SAW) is belied.

وآخر دعوانا ان الحمد لله رب العلمين

Muhammad Shafi *(May Allaah forgive him)*
Rabi uth Thani 1373, January 1954
Translation edited by
A.H.Elias (Mufti)
20th Zill Qadah 1432
18th October 2011